











AN

# INQUIRY

INTO THE SCRIPTURAL IMPORT OF THE WORDS

SHEOL,

HADES, TARTARUS, AND GEHENNA:

ALL TRANSLATED

HELL,

IN THE COMMON ENGLISH VERSION.

---

BY WALTER BALFOUR,  
Charlestown, Mass.

---

THIRD EDITION.

BOSTON:  
PUBLISHED BY BENJ. B. MUSSEY, 29 CORNHILL.  
LEONARD W. KIMBALL, PRINTER.

---

1832.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1832, by  
**WALTER BALFOUR,**  
in the Clerk's office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

## CONTENTS.

---

Introduction,	-	-	-	-	-	-	v
---------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

### CHAPTER I.

SECT. I.	All the passages of Scripture considered, in which Sheol occurs, translated pit, grave, and hell, in the common version,	-	-	-	-	13
SECT. II.	All the passages in which Hades occurs, considered, rendered grave, and hell, in the common version,	-	-	-	-	58
SECT. III.	2 Peter ii. 4, in which Tartarus occurs, considered, rendered hell in the common version,	-	-	-	-	19

### CHAPTER II.

	Gehenna, uniformly translated hell in the New Testament, considered, as a place of eternal punishment,	-	-	-	-	105
SECT. I.	Remarks on Dr. Campbell's views of Gehenna,	-	-	-	-	105
SECT. II.	A number of facts stated, showing that Gehenna was not used by the New Testament writers, to express a place of endless misery,	-	-	-	-	123
SECT. III.	All the passages in which Gehenna occurs, considered,	-	-	-	-	132
SECT. IV.	Additional facts stated, proving that Gehenna was not used by the sacred writers, to express a place of endless misery,	-	-	-	-	196
SECT. V.	The argument derived from the Targums, and other Jewish writings, that Gehenna means a place of endless misery, considered,	-	-	-	-	231
SECT. VI.	Objections considered,	-	-	-	-	265
SECT. VII.	Concluding remarks,	-	-	-	-	326

1870

1871

1872



## INTRODUCTION.

---

THE simple object of the author, in this Inquiry, is, to examine the foundation on which the doctrine of *endless* misery is built. This doctrine, rests on the *fact* or the *falsehood*, that a place called *hell*, in a future state, is prepared for the punishment of the wicked. In speaking, preaching, and writing on the subject, this is always taken for granted as indisputable. Most Universalists have conceded this to their opponents, and have contended, not against the existence of such a place of misery, but against the *endless* duration of its punishment.\* The principal writers, on both sides of this question, admit that there is a place of future punishment, and that the name of it is *hell*. Winchester, Murray, Chauncey Huntingdon, and others, admit that *hell* is a place of future punishment. Edwards, Strong, and others, who opposed them, had no occasion to prove this, but only to show that it was to be *endless* in its duration. This Inquiry, is principally for the purpose of Investigating, if what has been taken for granted by the one party, and conceded by the other, is a doctrine taught in Scripture. If the views I have advanced are false, it still leaves the question between Universalists and their opponents undisturbed. If they are found upon examination to be true, all dispute about *endless misery in hell* must of course cease, for if no such place exists, why dispute about the *endless* duration of its punishment?

\* When the first edition of the Inquiry was published, the author's attention was entirely directed to the *endless* duration of future punishment. From his examinations then, he had strong doubts of *limited* future punishment. Subsequent investigations, have confirmed and increased these doubts, nor has he seen any satisfactory evidence, that *limited* any more than *endless* punishment is taught in scripture. He thinks he has candidly considered all which his brethren have urged in defense of a *limited* future punishment, but the arguments used, and the scriptures quoted, only tend to confirm him in the opinion, that the doctrine of limited future punishment cannot be supported from the Bible. But, his ears are still open, to listen to what can be said on the subject.

The author is aware, that the subject he has undertaken to discuss, is both *solemn* and *important*, and that his sentiments, are not in unison with the principles and prejudices of the religious community. He is deeply sensible, that much learning, and piety, and popular opinion, are against him. The doctrine he opposes, is a fundamental article in most religious creeds, is taught weekly from almost every pulpit, and writings from the press are numerous in its support.

There are some, we hope many, who would rejoice to find it fairly and scripturally proved, that *hell* is not a place of endless punishment. Their benevolence of disposition, and their inability to reconcile this doctrine with the character of God and with many parts of his word, concur in leading them to wish, that clear and decided evidence of this might appear. From such, the author expects a candid and patient hearing of the evidence he has to produce. All he wishes, is, that his arguments, and explanations of Scripture may be impartially examined, and his views received or rejected accordingly. The importance of the subject demands, that it be candidly and impartially examined. But there are other considerations, which ought to excite universal attention to it. In the present day, various opinions are entertained as to the future punishment of the wicked, and that by men, eminent for both learning and piety. Some hold to the doctrine of *eternal* punishment, some to its being of *limited* duration. Others think they are to be *annihilated*, and some *hang in doubt*, not having any fixed belief on the subject. If the Bible does teach any thing certain on this subject, all ought to know it; and in no other way can this be ascertained, but by mutually communicating our researches for candid consideration to the public, and let all men, through a free press, read and judge for themselves. To deter men from investigation, on a subject which involves their eternal condition, is of all inquisitions the worst.

As to the sentiments advanced, the author makes no apology for them, nor does he claim any indulgence from his readers. He has appealed to the Scriptures, and to this test he desires his views to be brought for examination. If they are found false, no one can wish more sincerely than himself, to see their falsity detected. If true, they are of too much importance, and God's character is too much concerned, to be treated with indifference by judicious men. If God never threatened men with *endless*, or any misery in hell, it places his character in a very different light from that in which it is generally viewed.

The attempt has been made, to conduct this investigation in a cool, rational, and scriptural manner, and to express with plainness and candor the sentiments advanced, for the candid consid-

eration of others. We have endeavored to state, what we consider truth on this subject, and to state it in the spirit of the truth. Should any thing contrary to this be discerned, we hope the reader will impute it to inadvertence, and not to design.

In the course of the work, a number of quotations have been made from different authors. But few or none, have been taken from Universalist writers. We have purposely avoided this, and have availed ourselves of quotations from those, who, while opposed to the views advanced, have conceded many things in favor of them. The testimony of an opponent is always reckoned valuable. Such testimonies, might have been increased had it been necessary. But we rest the truth of the views advanced, on evidence we have drawn from Scripture.

The path in which the author has trod, in this Inquiry, has been new to himself, and but little frequented by other writers, of which he has any knowledge. That we have not in any instance, turned aside from the path of truth in our statements, we do not affirm. It would be surprising if we had not, for to err is human. All we can say, is, that we have studied to be accurate in our statements, and to be guided by the Scriptures in the explanations we have given. Should any trifling inaccuracies be pointed out, my time and habits of thinking, forbid my promising any reply. Any answer, meeting the body of the evidence produced, shall be attended to, either by acknowledging my error, or by defending what I have written. That the truth of God on this, and every other subject, may be made manifest and prevail, is the desire of the author, whatever may become of his sentiments.

In presenting, the third edition of the Inquiry to the public, it may be proper to inform the reader, of the following things respecting it. The first edition was published in 1824. It would be tedious, and would occupy more room than we can spare to notice all the attacks which have been made upon it, from the pulpit, and in the public journals, since its first publication. The instances, which have come within the range of our own personal knowledge and observation, have not been few. We shall only notice the attempts, which have been made to refute it, in regular book form.

The first attempt, was made by Mr. James Sabine, a Boston Clergyman, soon after the Inquiry was first published. A Gentleman, called on the Clergy in the public journals, either to refute the Inquiry, or confess they were deceiving the people. This call roused Mr. Sabine; and he announced in the public papers, his intention to refute the Inquiry, provided a suitable meeting house was obtained, his own being inconvenient for the purpose. When all sects, declined offering him a house for



the purpose, the Universalist Society in Charlestown, unanimously voted him the use of theirs. He accepted their offer; and delivered six discourses, one every other Sabbath evening, to excessively crowded audiences. He afterwards published his discourses; and our reply to them, appeared in 1825. This public, and published attack on the Inquiry, hastened a second edition of it in a cheaper form, but in every material respect the same as the first. Mr. Sabine's attempt to refute the Inquiry, was considered very generally a total failure. He did not pretend to advocate *endless* punishment; nor, did his discourses touch the principal facts and arguments contained in the Inquiry. All seemed to allow, his discourses did more evil than good, to the cause of endless punishment. They however, excited inquiry in the public mind, and somewhat promoted the demand for the Inquiry, which was very unpopular. Most people denounced it as a pernicious book, but felt perplexed with the evidence it contained, and were desirous to see it refuted.

The next attempt to refute the Inquiry, was made by Mr. Charles Hudson, a Universalist Clergyman, in Westminister, Mass. His letters appeared in 1827, and were replied to in my essays, which were published in 1828. Mr. Hudson's "reply" to my essays appeared in 1829; and in the same year, my letters in answer to it, were published. From some cause or other, like Mr. Sabine, he passed over the principal facts and arguments of the Inquiry, still leaving the book to be answered by some one else.

Dr. Allen, President of Bowdoin College, Maine, was the next person who made an attack on the Inquiry. This he did in a lecture, which he first delivered before the Students of the College, and afterwards published. We replied to his lecture, in a letter, which was published in 1828. The Dr.'s attempt to refute the Inquiry, was deemed so weak, even by his own friends, that his pamphlet was withdrawn from the bookstores and suppressed, if our information is correct. It is certain, it was frequently asked for in the bookstores in Boston, but could not be obtained; and very few persons in this region, ever procured a copy of it. The very weakness of this effort to refute the Inquiry, was calculated to lead many to think it could not be answered.

The last attempt, to refute the Inquiry, was made by Professor Stuart of Andover. From some cause or other, the public had long looked to him, to furnish a refutation of the Inquiry. The failure of the preceding attempts to refute it, was imputed by some to the want of talent. When Mr. Sabine did not succeed, we heard it remarked—"if Mr. Stuart only takes hold of it, he will easily refute it." At last, his exegetical essays ap-



peared in 1830. Though he avoids naming me, or the Inquiry in them, it is obvious enough to all, they were written to counteract the effect, which the Inquiry had produced on the public mind; and also, what I had written in my second Inquiry, on the words rendered everlasting, and forever, in our common version. We replied to these essays, in a series of letters addressed to Mr. Stuart, which were published in 1831. He has not yet made any reply to them. Here the controversy for the present rests.

Before Mr. Stuart's essays appeared, we supposed he must have something new and powerful to produce: that the Inquiry would receive a full and fair reply, and that I should see in what my error consisted. But we are entirely disappointed; for like all the preceding attempts to refute it, the principal facts and arguments are passed over without any notice. Indeed, many of Mr. Stuart's statements, confirm the views advanced in the Inquiry. We begin to suspect, no respectable reply can be made to it, which will prove, that Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, or Gehenna, designates a place of endless misery to the wicked. We have too high an opinion of Mr. Stuart's understanding, to think, that he considers his essays deserving the name of an answer to the Inquiry. We have never heard of a single intelligent man, orthodox or otherwise, who thinks his essays a reply to it. But we have heard several express a contrary opinion. If the book then is not unanswerable, we may say, it yet remains unanswered.

We have now a word or two to say, respecting this third edition of the Inquiry. In every material respect, it is the same as the first and second editions. The only alterations deserving notice, are the following. All the texts under Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, are arranged and considered, in the order they occur in the Bible. But the arguments and explanations are for substance the same as in the preceding editions. We have perhaps somewhat improved them from Mr. Stuart's essays. When we have dissented from him, we have quoted his words and remarked on them, or referred to our reply to his essays, where our remarks are to be found. Some slight alterations in the arrangement of the matter, in a few other places have been made; and some new matter has been introduced. But all the facts and arguments, and indeed the whole substance of the work, remains the same. We have seen nothing, nor have we been able to think of any thing, which alters the views we have expressed in the Inquiry. After all the attacks which have been made upon it, its foundation remains unshaken, and its pillars and posts unbroken. They have only tended to show, the solid foundation on which the views advocated in the Inquiry rest; and ought to excite my gratitude, to the men who

have made them. Without these attacks, I might have gone down to my grave doubting, whether I might not, after all, be mistaken in my views. It would be almost sinful in me now to doubt their correctness, considering the character, talents, and standing of the men, who have tried, but failed to point out my error.

No doubt, many will still think, I am greatly mistaken in my views. Well; perhaps I may be mistaken. But what would such people have me to do? Not surely to renounce my present views, until I am convinced by scripture facts and arguments, that they are wrong. If they believe me to be in error, why not make a further attempt to show this? My eyes are not closed, my ears are not dull of hearing, nor is my heart, I trust waxed so fat, but I shall attend to evidence drawn from scripture, to convince me of my error. Let my blood then, be on the head of those, who condemn me for my error, yet refuse to furnish me with scriptural evidence, that I am wrong and they are right in their opinions.

Because all past attempts to refute the inquiry, have been fruitless, I do not say, but it may yet be done. My earnest desire is, that it should be accomplished, if it can be done. What profit can it be to me to continue in error? I have attended with serious care, to all the attacks made on the inquiry, but so far from convincing me that my views are unscriptural, they have strongly confirmed me in their correctness. Whether this arises from obstinacy in error on my part, or weakness on the part of those who made these attacks, let others judge. My own opinion is, the views I have stated are the *truth*; for if they had been false, the talents and learning of the men, with whom I have had to contend, would long before now have exposed them. If my views have not been refuted, no one can say now, it was only because *dwarfs* attempted it. Who is a greater *giant* among orthodox people, than Professor Stuart?

We have heard it repeatedly observed, allowing all the texts in the Bible were laid aside, which speak of Sheol, Hades, Tartarus and Gehenna, the doctrine of endless punishment can be established from other texts. Well; if people are sincere in making this observation, why not lay all such useless texts aside, and support the doctrine of endless punishment from these other texts? But, does Mr. Stuart and others pursue this course? No; he knows too much to adopt it. He well knows, that if the texts which speak of Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna or hell, are abandoned, the whole foundation of endless punishment is broken up, and no other foundation can be found for it in scripture. Mr. Stuart holds fast to this, as his last and only hope of safety, for the doctrine of endless punishment. Give up

the texts which speak of *hell*, and every man, woman, and child, would question the truth of this doctrine. Tell them, *hell* is not a place of endless punishment, or of any punishment in a future state, and their resentment would be roused to indignation, against their religious teachers, for so long imposing on the public.

The time has now arrived, when people will inquire into the truth of the doctrine of endless punishment. Pulpit declamation, against the doctrine of universal salvation, has lost its effect; and the terrors of an endless hell, frighten very few, except the weak and ill informed in the community. Seeing people are disposed to investigate this subject, let not the believers in endless punishment, now attempt to hush the subject to rest. We entreat them to bring forth all their strength, if they have not done it already. Truth can never lose anything, by free, amicable, and candid discussion.

Some good people, have a great aversion to all religious controversy. But how can this be avoided, so long as people differ about the true sense of Scripture. Shall we sit down contented, believing that endless punishment, and the opposite doctrine are both true? Had the reformers deprecated all religious controversy, no reformation could have been effected. Yea, had the Scripture writers declined all controversy, the truth of God had long ago been banished from the earth. The Bible is full of religious controversy, for God's truth, in all ages has been at war with error, in the various shapes it has assumed. It had to contend with Paganism, Judaism, and other systems of religion, ages ago. In modern times, the various Christian sects have their religious controversies with each other; and even persons belonging to the same sect, have their religious discussions. Have not the Unitarians, and those called orthodox, had lately their religious controversies? Have not the Presbyterians, and the Congregationalists also had their controversies? And is not religious controversy, now going on among the orthodox people, in this very region. But what are the points discussed among them, compared with the one discussed in the following pages—*is the doctrine of endless punishment true?* All other controversies compared to this, are like the small dust in the balance. Every other controversy ought to cease, until this question is settled. And if settled, that endless punishment is unscriptural, it would put an end to many other controversies which exist. It would at least produce better feelings, among many professed Christians towards each other.

Religious controversy to be sure, proves our imperfection in knowledge. But it only becomes a serious evil, when we indulge our own evil passions in conducting it. But let us study

to avoid this, and ever remember, that the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God. We ought to contend *earnestly*, but not *bitterly* for the faith once delivered to the saints. It is pleasing to observe, that in our day, religious controversy is conducted in a much better spirit, than in former years. The spirit of the truth, seems to have more influence over the mind in contending for it, and we hope, is one of the signs of the times, that all sects are making a nearer approach to the unadulterated truth of God taught in the Scriptures.

To conclude. The Bible contains the whole of my religion. To this book I have appealed for the truth of my opinions. If any one should deem it proper, to make another attempt to refute the Inquiry, I beg of him to confine his attention to this book. An appeal made to the later Jewish writers, can never settle the questions at issue. To abridge the discussion as much as possible, I propose the following mode, of bringing it in the shortest way to a close. Let the text or texts be selected, which are supposed the strongest in the Bible, in proof of the doctrine of endless punishment, and let them be fully and fairly examined. If but one text teaches this doctrine, I am made a convert to it. Whoever then thinks, the bible is full of the doctrine, let them make the best selection of texts they can, and come forward with them for discussion. If alive and in health, we shall attend to the evidence which may be produced, for what saith the scriptures is the grand question with us in all our investigations?



# AN INQUIRY, &c.

---

## CHAPTER I.

WORDS are signs of Men's ideas, and were used as such by the inspired writers, as they must be by every man who speaks and writes to be understood. To understand their writings, it is necessary to ascertain what sense they affixed to their words, and this we can only learn, by consulting Scripture usage of them. That men have attached ideas to some Scripture words and phrases, which they never meant to convey by them, will not be denied. That this is not the case with the words *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tatarus*, and *Gehenna*, which we propose to examine, ought not to be taken for granted.

---

## SECTION I.

ALL THE PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE CONSIDERED, IN WHICH SHEOL OCCURS, TRANSLATED PIT, GRAVE, AND HELL, IN THE COMMON VERSION.

THE idea which most Christians have attached to the word *hell*, is a *place of eternal punishment for all the wicked*. Wherever they meet with this word, it

calls up the idea of such a place of punishment, and by many it will be deemed the worst of *heresies*, to give it any other signification. The cry of *heresy* ought not, however, to deter us from candidly inquiring, “what is truth?” on this deeply interesting question.

It is well known that there are four words in the original languages of the Bible, which are all translated by the word *hell*, in our common English version. These are Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna. The two first of these words are sometimes translated *grave*, as well as *hell*; the two last always *hell* in the common translation.

There is one fact, which deserves attention at the outset, of which many readers of the Bible are ignorant. The fact I allude to, is, that the word *sheol*, *hell* does not occur in the Old Testament, where it means a place of *eternal* misery for the wicked.\* The fact is indisputable; no man can doubt it who will take the trouble to examine this matter for himself. Nor is this a novel opinion, or a new discovery of mine. The fact is attested by some of the ablest writers, who believed in this doctrine. Dr. Campbell, in his 6th Preliminary Dissertation, thus writes:—“as to the word *Hades* which occurs in eleven places of the New Testament, and is rendered *hell* in all, except one, where it is translated *grave*, it is quite common in the classical authors, and frequently used by the Seventy, in the translation of the Old Testament. *In my judgment it ought never in Scripture to be rendered HELL, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by Christians.* In the Old Testament, the corresponding word is *Sheol*, which signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery. In translating

\* Professor Stuart says—“*sheol* designates *future punishment*,” but adds, we must also admit, that it does not determine, of itself, the *duration* of that punishment.” *Exeget. Essays*, p. 107.

that word, the Seventy have almost invariably used *Hades*. This word is also used sometimes in rendering the nearly synonymous words or phrases *bor* and *abnebor*, *the pit*, and *stones of the pit*, *tsal moth*, *the shades of death*, *dumeh*, *silence*. The state is always represented under those figures which suggest something dreadful, dark, and silent, about which the most prying eye, and listening ear, can acquire no information. The term *Hades*, is well adapted to express this idea. It was written anciently, as we learn from the poets (for what is called the poetic, is nothing but the ancient dialect) *aides*, *ab a privativo et eido video*, and signifies obscure, hidden, invisible. To this the word *Hell* in its primitive signification, perfectly corresponded. For, at first, it denoted only what was secret or concealed. This word is found with little variation of form, and precisely in the same meaning, in all the Teutonic dialects.

“But though our word *hell* in its original signification, was more adapted to express the sense of *Hades* than of *Gehenna*, it is not so now. When we speak as Christians, we always express by it, the place of the punishment of the wicked after the general judgment, as opposed to heaven, the place of the reward of the righteous. It is true, that in translating heathen poets, we retain the old sense of the word *hell*, which answers to the Latin *orcus*, or rather *infernus*, as when we speak of the descent of Eneas, or of Orpheus, into *hell*. Now the word *infernus*, in Latin, comprehends the receptacle of all the dead, and contains both *elysium*, the place of the blessed, and *Tartarus*, the abode of the miserable. The term *inferni*, comprehends all the inhabitants good and bad, happy and wretched. The Latin words *infernus*, and *inferni*, bear evident traces of the notion that the repository of the souls of the departed is underground.\* This appears also to have been the opinion

\* What sacred writer, I ask, says, “the repository of the *souls* of the

of both Greeks and Hebrews, and indeed of all antiquity. How far the ancient practice of burying the body, may have contributed to produce this idea concerning the mansion of the ghosts of the deceased, I shall not take upon me to say; *but it is very plain, that neither in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, nor in the New, does the word Hades convey the meaning which the present English word HELL, in the Christian usage, always conveys to our minds.*

“It were endless to illustrate this remark, by an enumeration and examination of all the passages in both Testaments wherein the word is found. The attempt would be unnecessary, as it is hardly now pretended by any critic, that this is the acceptation of the term in the Old Testament. Who, for example would render the words of the venerable patriarch Jacob, Gen. xxxvii. 35, when he was deceived by his sons into the opinion that his favorite child Joseph had been devoured by a wild beast, *I will go down to hell to my son mourning?* or the words which he used, ch. xlii. 38, when they expostulated with him about sending his youngest son Benjamin into Egypt along with them, *Ye will bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to hell?* Yet in both places the word, in the original, is *Sheol*, and in the version of the Seventy, *Hades*. I shall only add, that in the famous passage from the Psalms, xvi. 10, quoted in the Acts of the Apostles, Acts ii. 27, of which I shall have occasion to take notice afterwards, though the word is the same both in Hebrew and in Greek, as in the two former quotations, and though it is in both places rendered *hell* in the common version, it would be absurd to understand it as denoting the place of the damned, whether the expression be interpreted literally of David the type, or of Jesus Christ the antitype, agreeably to

departed is under ground?” We shall see afterwards, from Dr. Campbell himself, and Whithy, that this is a heathen notion. Mr. Stuart confirms this.



its principle and ultimate object.”—I have made this long quotation from Dr. Campbell at the outset for several reasons.

1st, It shows that Sheol of the Old Testament, and Hades of the New, both translated by our English word hell, did not originally signify a place of misery for the wicked, but simply the state of the dead, without regard to the goodness or badness of the persons, their happiness or misery. It follows of course, that wherever those two words are used in Scripture, though translated by the word hell, we ought not to understand a place of misery to be meant by the inspired writers.

2d, It establishes also, that our English word hell, in its primitive signification, perfectly corresponded to Hades and Sheol, and did not, as it now does, signify a place of misery. It denoted only what was secret or concealed. What we wish to be noticed here, is, that people generally have connected the idea of misery with the word *hell*, but it is evident that it is a very false association. It is beyond all controversy, that the word *hell* is changed from its original signification to express this idea.

3d, It is also obvious from the above quotation, and from other authors which might be quoted, that *Gehenna* is the word which is supposed to express the idea of a place of *endless* misery. The correctness of this opinion we shall consider afterwards. At present it need only be observed, that if the opinion be correct, it is somewhat surprising that the English word *hell* must assume a new sense to accomodate it with a name. Nor, was this the original sense of the term *Gehenna*, as I shall show afterwards.

4th, I add, in regard to the statements made in the above quotation, that they are not opinions broached by a Universalist, in support of his system. No; they are the statements of Dr. Campbell, who was not a Universalist. Nor are they his own individual singular opin-

ions, but are now admitted as correct by learned orthodox critics and commentators. In Mr. E. J. Chapman's critical and explanatory notes, we find very similar statements made, on Acts ii. 27; which, to save room I forbear transcribing.

5th, It is now generally conceded, that the doctrine of *endless* punishment, is not taught in the Old Testament. Mr. Stuart does not pretend that it is taught there; but begs of his readers to grant, that *probably, future punishment may be taught in five texts*. Was it then brought to light by the gospel? This cannot possibly be true; for the fact is indisputable, that the doctrine of *endless punishment* was current among the heathen nations, long before the appearance of Jesus Christ. Who then I ask, revealed this doctrine to the heathen nations, yet left the Jewish nation in ignorance concerning it? If it is said, it originated in early revelations which are now lost, I ask, how happened it, that the heathen knew so much, and the Jews so little about them? And if Moses, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, believed that the doctrine of endless misery originated in lost revelations, why did he not teach it in his writings? But how could he refrain from teaching it, had he believed it true? The Jews could not avoid *endless* misery, for they knew nothing about it, they died, went down to *hell*, and the torments of the place, give them the first notice that such misery awaited them. If they did know any thing about it, they might thank the heathen around them for the information; notwithstanding God had prohibited intercourse with them, or learning doctrines from them.

As the doctrine of endless punishment, being taught in the Old Testament, is abandoned, our attention must be directed to the inquiry, does it teach *future* punishment after death? Is this taught by the term *Sheol*? Let us examine the passages where it occurs and see? I shall take them up, in the order they occur in the common version.

Gen, xxxvii. 35. Jacob, said concerning his son Joseph—"I will go down into the grave (Sheol), unto my son mourning." *Grave*, is here the correct rendering of *Sheol*, for surely no one thinks, Jacob believed Joseph had gone to *hell*, and that he also expected to go down to the same place of misery. But Dr. Allen says—"it is altogether probable, that he (Jacob), had reference to the abode of departed spirits, where he hoped to meet his son. But our translators by using the word *grave*, have excluded this important and interesting idea, annihilated the strong hopes of paternal affection and enlightened piety." But what is it, which makes this probable? for there is not a text in the Bible, which says, *Sheol*, is "the abode of departed spirits," or even names "*departed spirits*."

Gen, xlii. 38. concerning Benjamin Jacob said—"If mischief befall him by the way in which ye go, then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave (Sheol)." Evidently *grave*, in the same sense as the preceding passage.

Gen. xliv. 29. Jacob again says—"ye shall bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the *grave*," in the same sense as above.

Gen. xliv. 31. Judah, in making a speech for the liberation of Benjamin, said—"thy servants, shall bring down the gray hairs of thy servant our father with sorrow to the grave (Sheol)." Obviously *grave* as in the three preceding passages. See the quotation from Dr. Campbell above.

Numb. xvi. 30. Moses said, concerning Korah and his company—"but if the Lord make a new thing, and the earth open her mouth, and swallow them up, with all that appertain unto them, and they go down quick into the pit (Sheol)." If *Sheol*, here rendered *pit*, means *hell* in its common acceptation, then Korah, his company, and all appertaining to them, went down alive there. But what is meant, is explained v. 32, by

“the earth opening her mouth, and swallowing them up, and their houses, and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods.” They were swallowed up as whole cities have been by an earthquake. Who believes, that people go down alive, soul and body to *hell*, or *endless misery*? For it is the common opinion, no *bodies* go there until after the resurrection. Besides—did those persons, houses, and their goods, go there with them, for all went down into the pit, what ever place this was?

Num. xvi. 33. “They and all that appertained to them, (i. e. Korah and his company), went down alive into the pit (Sheol); and the earth closed upon them: and they perished from among the congregation.” The sense here, is the same as in the passage preceding. But in reference to both these passages, it is said by Professor Stuart—“that Korah and his company went to the world of woe, there can be but little if any reason to doubt, considering their character, and the nature of their crime.” This is being wise above what is written, for Moses, nor any other sacred writer, intimates any such thing. Mr. Stuart says himself, in the very next sentence—“but the words of Moses in this place, seem to refer primarily to the event which was about to take place, viz. to Korah and his adherents being swallowed up alive, and thus going down into the under world.” Can a particle of evidence be produced, that Moses referred to any thing else?

Deut. xxxii. 22. “For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, (Sheol), and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains.” Moses is here foretelling God’s judgments on the Jewish nation; and it required such a tremendous image, thus to describe them; even a fire, which should burn unto the lowest *Sheol*. The figure of *fire*, is common in Scripture to describe God’s judgments on men; and as on the Jew-



ish nation, came all the righteous blood shed on the earth, so here the description of their punishment, is set forth by a tremendous fire. But if by the *lowest hell*, we understand a place of endless misery, there must be three divisions of it, for the lowest hell, supposes some hells above it, and all these hells must be burnt through for this fire to reach it. But who believes this? Besides, it may be asked, was David ever in this *lowest hell*? For he says to God—"thou hast delivered my soul (me) from the lowest hell," Ps. lxxxvi. 13. I may add, no intimation is here given, or any where else, that in this *lowest hell* any persons are suffering misery there.

1 Sam. ii. 6. "The Lord killeth, and maketh alive: he bringeth down to the grave, (Sheol) and bringeth up." *Grave, or state of the dead*, is evidently the meaning of *Sheol* here, as the two parts of the verse show. The words in the last part—"he bringeth down to *Sheol* and bringeth up," answers to the words in the first, "the Lord killeth, and maketh alive." Indeed, who believes, that the Lord brings men up from *Sheol*, or *hell*, in the popular sense of this term? and yet, if *Sheol* means *hell*, it is here plainly asserted.

2 Sam. xxii. 6. "The sorrows of *hell*, (Sheol), compassed me about; the snares of death prevented me," or, came upon me. The parallelism here, shows what is meant. In the first part of the verse—"the sorrows of *hell*, (Sheol), compassed me about," is explained by the second—"the snares of death" prevented me." "Sorrows of *Sheol*," and "snares of death," express the same idea. See on Ps. xviii. 5, below.

1 Kings ii. 6. David charged Solomon thus—"do therefore according to thy wisdom, and let not his (Joab) hoar head go down to the grave (Sheol) in peace," let him die, according to the laws, a violent death for the crimes he hath committed. Solomon, could not send Joab to *hell*,

1 Kings ii. 9. David charged Solomon thus concerning Shimei—"But his hoar head bring thou down to the grave (Sheol) with blood." No fault, is generally found with David, in charging Solomon respecting Joab, but he has often been blamed for cruelty towards Shimei. I quote the following from the *Missionary Magazine*, vol. 7, p. 333, which places his conduct in a different light. It is there said,—“David is here represented in our English version as finishing his life with giving a command to Solomon to kill Shimei; and to kill him on account of that very crime, for which he had sworn to him by the Lord, he would not put him to death. The behavior thus imputed to the king and prophet, should be examined very carefully, as to the ground it stands upon. When the passage is duly considered, it will appear highly probable that an injury has been done to this illustrious character. It is not uncommon in the Hebrew language to omit the negative in a second part of a sentence, and to consider it as repeated, when it has been once expressed, and is followed by the connecting particle. The necessity of so very considerable an alteration, as inserting the particle *NOT*, may be here confirmed by some other instances. Thus Psalm i. 5. ‘The ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, *NOR* (the Hebrew is *and*, signifying *and not*) sinners in the congregation of the righteous.’ Psalm ix. 18: xxxviii. 1: lxxv. 5. Prov. xxiv. 12. If, then, there are many such instances, the question is whether the negative, here expressed in the former part of David’s command, may not be understood as to be repeated in the latter part? And if this may be, a strong reason will be added why it *should* be so interpreted. The passage will run thus: ‘Behold, thou hast with thee Shimei, who cursed me: but I swear to him by the Lord, saying, I will not put thee to death by the sword. Now, therefore, hold him *NOT* guiltless, (for thou art a wise man, and knowest what thou

oughtest to do unto him,) but bring not down his hoary head to the grave with blood." Now, if the language itself will admit this construction, the sense thus given to the sentence derives a very strong support from the context. For, how did Solomon understand this charge? Did he kill Shimei in consequence of it? Certainly he did not. For, after he had immediately commanded Joab to be slain, in obedience to his father, he sends for Shimei, and, knowing that Shimei ought to be well watched, confines him to a particular spot in Jerusalem for the remainder of his life. 1 Kings, ii. 36—42. See *Kennicott's Remarks*, p. 131." Those who wish to see this verse noticed at considerable length, may consult the *Christian's Magazine*, vol. i p. 172—181. David, could not surely mean, respecting either Joab or Shimei, their hoary head bring thou down to *endless misery* with blood.

Job vii. 9. "As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away: so he that goeth down to the grave (Sheol) shall come up no more." The next verse, explains the writer's meaning;—"he shall no more return to his house, neither shall his place know him any more."

Job xi. 8. "It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? Deeper than hell (Sheol): what canst thou know?" The antithesis here shews, what is meant by *Sheol*, for it is contrasted with the *heaven* for height. The sea, or abyss, is probably alluded to. See verse 7. No man can by searching find out God, any more than he can measure the height of heaven, or the depth of the abyss. *Sheol* included the abyss, for it was the state of all the dead, whether in the abyss, grave or tomb, etc.

Job xiv. 13. "Oh that thou wouldest hide me in the grave (Sheol)." The context shews, Job longed for death, to find rest in the grave. No man supposes, Job prayed, that God would hide him in the place of endless misery.

Job xvii. 13. "If I wait, the grave (Sheol) is mine house." I must die at last, and I may as well die now, as at any future period.

Job xvii. 16. "They shall go down to the bars of the pit, (Sheol), when our rest together is in the dust." The *grave* or sepulchre, is here evidently referred to by *Sheol* rendered *pit*. Corruption and the worms were to be with Job there, which he explains to be "in the dust." Not surely in *hell*, or *endless misery*.

Job xxi. 13. "They spend their days in wealth, and in a moment go down to the grave (Sheol)." Our translators understood *Sheol* here to mean *grave*, and have rendered it so; and the fact stated, we see daily occurring around us. This, is the first of Professor Stuarts five texts, in which he thinks, *Sheol*—"may designate the future world of woe." But he places little dependence on it, for he says—"Job xxi. 13, is not altogether so probable as to afford entire satisfaction. Verses, 17, 18, 21, 30—33, it may be alleged, seem rather to incline the mind to construe *Sheol* in v. 13 as meaning *grave*; and so our translators have done." The general usage of *Sheol*, by his own confession, is also opposed to construing it otherwise than *grave*.

Job xxiv. 19. "Drought and heat consume the snow waters; so doth the grave, (Sheol), those which have sinned." This is true of the *grave*; but does *hell*, the *world of woe*, consume those which have sinned?

Job xxvi. 6. "Hell (Sheol) is naked before him, and destruction hath no covering." What is called *hell* or *Sheol* in the first part of the verse, is called *destruction* in the last. *Hell* here, has the sense of *grave*, as in the apostles creed, and other texts.

Psal. vi. 5. For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave, (Sheol), who shall give thee thanks." The parallelism here shews, that *grave* is the meaning of *Sheol*. The first part of the verse, "in death there is no remembrance of thee," explains what is meant in



the last, "in the grave (Sheol) who shall give thee thanks." Did David expect to go to the world of woe? And who ever supposed, it was a place for praising God?

Ps. ix. 17. "The wicked shall be turned into hell, (Sheol), and all the nations that forget God." This is the second text, on which Professor Stuart depends, that "*Sheol may designate the future world of woe.*" But probably perceiving, that the context stood opposed to such a view of it, he passes it without remark. Dr. Allen gives this text up as teaching future punishment. He says—"But probably the punishment expressed, is cutting off from life, destroying from the earth, by some special judgment, and removing to the invisible place of the dead." But there is no text in which the word Sheol occurs, which has been more frequently quoted than this, to prove that by hell, is meant a place of misery for the wicked. The wicked are the persons spoken of, and they are said to be turned into hell, with all the nations that forget God. Plausible as this appears, we have only to consult the context, to see that no such idea was intended by the writer. The Psalm in which the words stand, is treating of God's temporal judgments upon the heathen nations. We think if verses 15—20, are consulted, this will sufficiently appear. What leads people to think, that this passage refers to eternal misery, is, the false idea which they have attached to the word hell. But surely no one, who has attended to all the texts, can continue to believe that *Sheol* here, has such a meaning. It is the same hell into which the wicked are turned, which Jacob said he would go down to Joseph mourning. It is the same hell in which the Savior's soul was not left. It is the same hell David prayed the wicked might go down quick, or alive into. When I can believe that David prayed the wicked might go down alive to a place of endless misery, and that Korah and his company did

go there alive, it is possible I may believe the text before us contains the answer to David's prayer. But it will not be easy to produce evidence of this. The fact is, it would prove too much. It would prove that all the heathen nations must go to eternal misery, a thing which few are prepared to admit. Ask the question of the most zealous advocates of the doctrine,—are all the heathen nations turned into eternal misery? They hesitate, to say *yes*. But why do they so? For if *Sheol* means such a place, the passage is explicit in declaring it.

It perhaps may be objected to this view of the text,—are not all good people turned into *Sheol*, or the state of the dead, as well as the wicked? why then is it said the wicked shall be turned into *hell* with all the nations that forget God? The answer to this is easy. Though all good people in David's day, went to *Sheol*, as well as the wicked, yet not in the way he is here speaking of the wicked. David is speaking of God's public judgments on the heathen, and by those judgments they were to be cut off from the earth, or turned into *Sheol*. It is one thing to die, and quite another to be cut off by the judgments of God from the earth. I shall only add, if all the wicked, yea, all the nations who forgot God in those days were turned into a place of endless misery, upon what principles are we to justify the character of God, or of good men, for their want of feeling towards them, or their exertions to save them from it? We are told that the times of this ignorance God winked at: that he suffered all nations to walk after their own ways. If all the heathen nations were turned into a place of endless misery, neither God, nor good men felt, spoke, or acted, as if this was true.

Psal. xvi. 10. "For thou wilt not leave my soul, (me), in hell (*Sheol*): neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." Peter quotes this text, Acts ii. 24—32, and applies it to the resurrection of

Christ from the dead. He was not left in *Sheol*, or the *grave*. That grave only is meant, seems obvious from the next words—"neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." On this text Professor Stuart says—"Can the soul of Jesus be supposed to have been in the *world of woe, the place of the damned*? I know, indeed, that there are some, who deduce from this passage the doctrine of a *purgatory*, into which Christ descended, in order to preach to the spirits who are in prison! But there is no foundation in this text, for any such deduction." But is there not, just as much foundation for such a deduction in this text, as there is in any text where *Sheol* occurs, that it is "*a world of woe, the place of the damned*?" The bible may just as well be quoted to prove a *purgatory* as it. Where does it teach, that such a *prison* exists? or what text can he adduce, to prove, there are any *spirits* in it to be preached to? We will thank Mr. Stuart, or any other man, to produce proof of these things from scripture. He takes for granted such a *prison* exists, and that there are *damned spirits* in it, but lacks in benevolence, to let Christ go there and preach to them. But if one of these things, is believed without scripture authority, why not all of them?

Ps. xviii. 5. "The sorrows of hell, (*Sheol*), compassed me about; the snares of death prevented me." See on 2 Sam. xxii. 6, above for the same sense of *sheol*. In both places, and in others, where *Sheol* is rendered *hell*, nothing but the popular sense attached to this word, leads people to think of a place of future punishment. It would have been well, if *Sheol* had in all cases been left untranslated, for then people would have looked to the context for the meaning of the writer.

Ps. xxx. 3. "O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul (me) from the grave (*Sheol*): thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit." The parallel-

ism in this verse, shows its meaning; for what is expressed in the first part, is explained in the second. Was the writer ever in *hell*, the world of woe? And was he ever brought up from it?

Ps. xxxi. 17. "Let the wicked be ashamed, and let them be silent in the grave (*Sheol*)."

On this text I ask 1st, If *Sheol* means hell, the world of future punishment, how could David or any good man pray, "let the wicked be *silent* in this hell?" In this case, David was nothing behind the bold blasphemer, who sends his companions off to hell with his prayers and curses. But 2d. If *Sheol* means *hell*, did David think it a place of silence, for he says—"let the wicked be ashamed, and let them be *silent in Sheol*." No one believes now, hell is a place of *silence*, for it is said to be a place, where the wicked are weeping, and wailing, and gnashing their teeth. This does not look, as if it was a place of much silence. But 3d. Admit David here only means, let the wicked be ashamed, and let them be silent in the *grave*; how could he ever pray for this as a good man, if he believed in any future punishment; for just so sure as they were turned into the grave, their souls went to hell to be punished, according to the common opinions. By implication then, if he believed in any future punishment, he prayed, the wicked might go to *hell* to suffer it. What good man now, prays so? 4th. But if we admit, David knew of no future punishment after death, all difficulty is removed. As a good man, and a king, David might pray, that the wicked might be cut off by death; or as Mr. Stuart expresses it—"that the justice due to them in a *civil* respect, might be executed."

Ps. xlix. 14. "Like sheep they are laid in the grave, (*Sheol*); death shall feed on them; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning; and their beauty shall consume in the grave, (*Sheol*) from their dwelling." *Sheol* occurs here twice; and is prop-



erly rendered grave by our translators, for are any *sheep* laid in *hell*, *the world of woe*? or, does any person's beauty consume there?

Ps. xlix. 15. "But God will redeem my soul (me) from the power of the grave, (Sheol), for he shall receive me." Evidently *grave* here as in the last verse, for in what sense could David be under the power of *the world of woe*, and was redeemed from it? But on this text Mr. Stuart says—"whether under this imagery more than a literal meaning is not conveyed as also in the example above, (Ps. xlix. 14), will be matter of inquiry in the sequel." But all he says in the sequel, is this, p. 113. "Let any one now, in addition to these texts, carefully inspect such passages as Num. xvi. 30, 33. Deut. xxxii. 22. 1 Kings, ii. 6. Ps. xlix. 14, 15. Is. v. 14, and then say, whether the Hebrew believing in a state of future retribution, did not connect such language, in his own thoughts, with the apprehension of future misery in regard to those of whom he thus spoke." But the very question in dispute is, did the Hebrew "*believe in a state of future retribution?*" Until this point is settled, it is premature to inquire, "whether the Hebrew did connect such language in his own thoughts, with the apprehension of future misery in regard to those of whom he thus spoke." It is surprising that a man of Mr Stuart's attainments, should assume the very question in debate. Besides, who can tell what *the Hebrew thought*, or *connected* with his thoughts, but by what he has expressed in the language he used?

Ps. lv. 15. "Let death seize upon them, and let them go down quick into hell (Sheol)." Mr. Stuart on this text says—"there is a serious difficulty in the way of supposing the Psalmist to have prayed, that his enemies should go down suddenly to the world of future woe. Here, however, our English version renders *sheol* by *hell*; but why this should be done here, and

not in Ps. xxxi. 17, it would be difficult to say." This is indeed a *serious difficulty*, which we have noticed in Ps. xxxi. 17, above. Besides, we have shown there, that there is no possible way of getting rid of it, but by admitting, *Sheol* does not in any case designate the world of woe; and, that David did not believe in any punishment after death.

Ps. lxxxvi. 13. "Great is thy mercy toward me; and thou hast delivered my soul (me) from the lowest hell, (*Sheol*)."

On this text, Mr. Stuart says—"the next verse seems plainly to indicate, that deliverance from temporal death is here meant. It runs thus: 'O God! the proud are risen up against me; and the assemblies of violent men have sought after my soul, (my life), and have not set thee before them.' The word *nephish* which our translators have here redere*d* *soul*, is a common Hebrew word for *life*, and is very often so rendered. It clearly has that meaning here; for *soul*, in any other sense than this, David's enemies surely did not seek after. Consequently, we must conclude, that the deliverance commemorated in v. 13, is a deliverance from the grave, or under-world, i. e. from Death. By saying *lowest grave* or *sepulchre*, the writer designates a most terrible and cruel death, or a death of the most shocking nature." This is very much to the purpose. Let the reader notice, that lowest *sheol*, *hell*, *grave*, or *sepulchre*, simply means by Mr. Stuart's own confessions, "*a death of the most shocking nature.*"

Ps. lxxxviii. 3. "My soul is full of trouble; my life draweth near unto the grave, (*Sheol*). Certainly *grave* is here the proper rendering of *Sheol*, for the writer surely did not mean to say, his life drew near unto hell or endless misery. The context decides the sense of *Sheol* to be *grave*, for in v. 4, he says—"I am counted with them that go down into the pit;" and in v. 5, "like the slain that lie in the grave." Yea, says v. 6,

“thou hast laid me in the lowest pit;” and asks, v. 10, “wilt thou show wonders to the dead?” The phrase, “*lowest pit*” is equivalent to “lowest *hell* or *Sheol*,” Ps. lxxxvi. 13, above.

Ps. lxxxix. 48. “What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? shall he deliver his soul (life) from the hand of the grave (Sheol)?” The *hand* of the grave, simply means the *power* of the grave. And the Parallelism determines, that *Sheol* is correctly rendered *grave*. Surely some are delivered from *hell*, *the world of woe*.

Ps. cxvi. 3. “The sorrows of death compassed me, and the pains of hell (Sheol) gat hold upon me.” The “*sorrows of death*,” and “*pains of hell*,” are equivalent expressions. The same sentiment is expressed, 2 Sam. xxii. 6, and xviii. 5, above, already noticed.

Ps. cxxxix. 8. “If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, (Sheol), behold, thou art there.” The writer here, surely did not mean to say, if I make my bed in *hell*, *the world of woe*. This language is evidently used, to express the every where presence of God, as the context shows. See on some texts above.

Ps. cxli. 7. “Our bones are scattered at the graves’ (Sheol) mouth.” This is true of the grave; but are people’s bones scatterd at the mouth of *hell*, *the world of woe*?

Prov. i. 12. “Let us swallow them up alive as the grave, (Sheol); and whole, as those that go down into the pit.” The parallelism, as well as the context, sufficiently shews, *sheol* means *grave* as our translators have rendered it.

Prov. v. 5. “Her feet go down to death; her steps take hold on hell, (Sheol).” The equivalent to—“her steps take hold on Sheol,” is, “her feet go down to death.” Both express the premature or sudden death of a lewd woman. The parallelism, is similar here, to

that in Ps. vi. 5, Prov. i. 12, and other texts noticed already. This is Professor Stuart's third text, in which he thinks—" *Sheol may designate the future world of woe.*" He is correct in saying, this, and Prov. ix. 18, have respect to prostitutes, p. 109. But, the argument he draws from them, is founded in the mistake, that in the ancient world—"disease in some of its most awful forms," was not as now, a concomitant attending illicit intercourse. In my reply to his essays, I have fully considered this argument, to which I beg leave here, and on all his book to refer. It is sufficient here to notice, that v. 11 of the context, shows, Mr. Stuart must be mistaken. It runs thus—"and thou mourn at the last, when thy flesh and thy body are consumed." What do these words mean, if "disease in some of its most awful forms," was not then a concomitant attending illicit intercourse?" Medical men aver, that such a disease is produced without *illicit* intercourse; and that it no doubt existed in the ancient world, though not known then by its modern names.

Prov. ix. 18. "But he knoweth not that the dead are there, and that her guests are in the depths of hell, (*Sheol*).<sup>3</sup>" This is Professor Stuart's fourth text, in proof, that "*Sheol may designate the future world of woe.*" But his argument founded on this text, is drawn from the same mistake, as noticed on the preceding text. He renders this passage thus—"but he knoweth not that the *ghosts* are there." What *ghosts*? Are they living beings, disembodied spirits? Not a word of this can be true, by Mr. Stuart's own confessions, for he says, p. 121, "a deep region beneath peopled with *ghosts*, is what we do not believe in." Besides, we have shown in our reply to his essays, that the term *repaim*, rendered *ghosts*, by him, and *dead* in the common version, has no reference to living beings of any kind, but to the dead body.

Prov. xv. 11. "Hell (*Sheol*) and destruction are be-



fore the Lord ; how much more then the hearts of the children of men ?” Here *Sheol* and *destruction* are joined, and plainly refer to the grave, where destruction takes place. If these are obvious to the sight of the Lord, much more the hearts of men.

Prov. xxxiii. 14. “Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell (*Sheol*).” The verse which precedes this, explains what is meant. “Withhold not correction from the child.” Why ? To save his soul from the world of woe ? No ; it is added, for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul (him) from the grave (*Sheol*).” The child, will bring himself to a premature death by his wicked course of life ; but if you apply the rod in time, it will drive his folly far from him, and prevent it. But this is Professor Stuart’s fifth and last text where he thinks—“*Sheol may designate the future world of woe.*” Let us now hear what he concedes about these texts. He says—“it is possible to interpret such texts as Prov. v. 5 ; ix. 18 ; xxiii. 14, as designating a death violent and premature, inflicted by the hand of heaven.” Thus much he concedes respecting three of his texts. Again, he says,—“The probability that *Sheol* designates the future punishment of the wicked, in the passages just cited, (all his five texts) depends perhaps in a great measure, on the state of knowledge among the Hebrews, with regard to future rewards and punishments.” But were not these very texts quoted to show, what was—“the state of knowledge among the Hebrews, with regard to future rewards and punishments ?” But it is confessed they do not teach this, for their teaching it, depends in a great measure, on the state of knowledge among the Hebrews, with regard to future rewards and punishments,” a thing they do not teach. If they did teach it, they would not need to depend on any thing else. The texts then, are nothing to Mr.

Stuart's purpose, even by his own confession, until it is proved, the Hebrews did believe as he asserts. He even concedes, the texts are susceptible of a different interpretation.

Prov. xxvii. 20. "Hell, (Sheol) and destruction are never full; so the eyes of man are never satisfied." Here again *Sheol* and *destruction* are joined. The grave and destruction never say they have enough; so the eyes of man are never satisfied with seeing. Why render *sheol hell* here?

Prov. xxx. 15, 16. "There are three things that are never satisfied, yea, four things say not, it is enough. The grave, (Sheol), and the barren womb; the earth that is not filled with water; and the fire that saith not, it is enough." It is strange, our translators, should have rendered *Sheol hell* in the last text, and render it here *grave*, where the same idea is conveyed. No one can suppose, that in either text, *Sheol* means *hell, the world of woe*.

Eccles. ix. 10. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might: for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, (Sheol), whither thou goest." No one doubts, that *Sheol* here means the *grave* as rendered in the English version, for such things could not be said concerning it, if it meant *hell* a place of future punishment. But if it meant in any case *hell*, it was liable to be misunderstood, thus to speak concerning it.

Cant. viii. 6. "For love is strong as death; jealousy is cruel as the grave (Sheol)." We know that the grave is cruel, for it spares neither age nor sex, and is a fine figure to describe the effects of strong jealousy. But how is it known, that *hell, the world of woe* is cruel, or, that jealousy resembles it?

Isai. v. 14. "Therefore hell (Sheol) hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure: and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he

that rejoiceth, shall descend into it." All allow, Sheol the grave is here personified. It is represented as having a mouth, opening it wide without measure, to receive the wicked with all their pomp and glory.

Isai. xiv. 9. "Hell, (Sheol), from beneath, is moved to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth; it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations." On this verse Professor Stuart says—"the prophet is speaking of the king of Babylon, who was to be slain, and when he should go down into *the under-world* or *Sheol* the ghosts or *umbræ* of the dead there, would rise up to meet him with insult and contumely. Our English version renders *Sheol* *hell*. But plainly *the region of the dead the land of ghosts* is here meant; for in verse, 18, all the kings of the nations are said to repose *in glory* there, i. e. to lie in their sepulchers, attended with all the ensigns of splendor which were deposited around the bodies of deceased kings." See in the next passage for further remarks.

Isai. xiv. 15. "Yet thou (the king of Babylon) shall be brought down, to hell (Sheol) to the sides of the pit." On this text Professor Stuart adds—"the word here is most evidently in the same sense as above; for so the parallelism which follows clearly shows, viz. "to the sides of the pit." On the two last texts, he gives us the following excellent remarks, pp. 121, 122. "A deep region beneath, peopled with ghosts, is what we do not believe in. Nor is there any more certainty that it is true, because this method of speaking about it in scripture is adopted, than that the sun goes round the earth, because they speak of it as doing so. In most cases, it is the language of poetry, which employs the popular methods of representation. It is poetry which gives a kind of life and animation to the inhabitants of the under-world. Poetry personifies that world. So in Isai. v. 14. Prov. xxvii. 20; xxx. 15, 16; i. 12.

Above all, is this the case, in that most striking passage, Isai. xiv : 9—20 ; (the two last passages), in which all commentators are compelled to admit a fictitious or imaginary costume. Here the ghosts rise up from their places of repose, and meet and insult the king of Babylon, and exult over his fall. All is life and animation, when he goes down into the under-world. Yet who was ever misled by this passage, and induced to regard it as a passage to be *literally* understood. But if this be very plain, then are other passages of a nature in any respect similar, equally plain also." On this quotation from Professor Stuart, I have a few remarks to make.

1st, He explicitly declares, that he has no faith in a deep region beneath peopled with ghosts. There is no more reason to believe this true, than that the sun goes round the earth. But we ask, are not *disembodied souls* or *spirits* considered *ghosts*? Well, Mr. Stuart believes in them. But perhaps his skepticism, does not respect their *existence*, but *the place of their habitation*; they are not in a deep region beneath. Be it so; we then ask—where does he locate them? Nowhere that I can find from his writings. No, nor does he attempt to prove, that they *exist* any where.

2d, The Professor tells us—"it is poetry which gives a kind of life and animation to the inhabitants of the under-world. Poetry personifies that world," and in the passages he cites, he assures us—"all commentators are compelled to admit a fictitious or imaginary costume. Here the ghosts rise up from their places of repose, and meet and insult the king of Babylon, and exult over his fall. All is life and animation, when he goes down into the under-world." Very well. We have then to ask, if all this be the language of *poetry*, where shall Professor Stuart find a text in the Old Testament, which is the language of *reality*, that any persons were *alive* in *Sheol*, or any where else after death? We do not demand, what on his system we have a right to demand,



that he produce a text, which says, persons are punished there. No, we only ask him to name the text, which teaches, that the king of Babylon, or any other person, was in a state of conscious existence after death, either in a region beneath, or, in any other region in the universe of God. He says—"in most cases it is the language of poetry, which employs the popular methods of representation." If it is not so in every case, he can produce the exceptions, where the language of inspiration, the language of *reality*, gives to persons after death *real life and animation*. What is proof positive, no such texts can be produced, is, Mr. Stuart has not produced them.

3d, If the plainest texts in the whole Bible, which represent persons alive after death, are abandoned by Mr. Stuart as the mere language of poetry, how is his system to be supported? He has abandoned them, and we are confident, he has none half so good as they are, to produce in support of it. But we doubt, if he would have abandoned them as the language of poetry, if it had only been said in one of them, concerning the king of Babylon or any other person—"and in *Sheol* he lifted up his eyes being in torment." This would have altered the passages, from a *fictitious* and *imaginary costume*, to *solemn reality*. No doubt but this would have been said, had the poets then known, that in the Hebrew *Sheol* there was a Tartarus, a place of torment. But at that period, the poets had not given such a popular representation to *Sheol*. We shall see afterwards, that the heathen Greeks, gave to *Hades* this popular representation; this *fictitious* and *imaginary costume*, which Mr. Stuart adopts without scruple as the truth of God. It is a strange inconsistency to say, when the king of Babylon goes down to *Sheol*, and all is life and animation on his arrival, this is only *fiction*, and when the rich man Luke xvi. 23, goes down to *Hades*, and all is life and animation, this is *solemn reality*. Does

not Mr. Stuart admit, *Sheol* and *Hades* are only the Hebrew and Greek names for the same place? And is he ignorant, how *Hades* came to differ from *Sheol* respecting such a representation? We shall refresh his memory about this in the sequel.

Isai. xxviii. 15. "Because ye have said, we have made a covenant with death, and with hell, (*Sheol*), are we at agreement." The persons mentioned, fancied themselves so secure, that they say, "with *Sheol* the grave we are at agreement." They add—"when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us: for we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves." But thus their way was their folly, for it is added,

Isai. xxviii. 18. "Your covenant with death, shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell, (*Sheol*) shall not stand." No covenant can be made with death and the grave, all must die, all go to *Sheol*. Hence it is added—"when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it."

Isai. xxxviii. 18. "For the grave (*Sheol*) cannot praise thee; death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." Here, what is expressed by the words—"the grave (*Sheol*) cannot praise thee," is explained by the next words—"death cannot celebrate thee." And is still further explained by the words—"they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." On this text Mr. Stuart says—"the meaning here is plain, viz. how can the dead, or those in the sepulchre praise thee? Surely we cannot well suppose Hezekiah means to say here, that hell, i. e. the world of torment, cannot praise God. He did not expect to perish forever, when he should die. But when he says, "*Sheol* cannot praise thee," does he mean, that after death there is no ability to praise God, no existance of the powers and capacities of the soul? I think not. It seems to me clearly, that

this is not his design ; although not a few of the later critics have affirmed it to be so. Shall we represent the Hebrews, and a Hebrew monarch enlightened as Hezekiah was, as being more ignorant in respect to futurity than the Egyptians? The people of God, who lived under the light of a revelation more ignorant than those who were in the midst of Egyptian night! Believe this who will, I must have stronger evidence of its correctness than I have yet found in order to give it credit." On this quotation I have to remark

1st, Hezekiah "did not expect to perish forever when he should die," for like all believers in divine revelation he hoped for a future life by a resurrection from the dead. But did he, or any other person, ever intimate, that he should praise God in *Sheol* after death? Did any one ever say he should be alive there? No. But it was incumbent on Mr. Stuart, to produce some declaration, or example from scripture, that in *Sheol* there is "ability to praise God; an existence of the powers and capacities of the soul" to do this. No doubt, could this have been found, he would have produced it.

2d, But Mr. Stuart's argument proves too much. It will prove, that the *transmigration of souls* is a scripture doctrine, for it was believed by those in Egyptian night. I then say to Mr. Stuart in his own words—"shall we represent the Hebrews, and a Hebrew monarch enlightened as Hezekiah was, as being more ignorant respecting the *transmigration of souls* than the Egyptians? The people of God, who lived under the light of a revelation, more ignorant than those who were in the midst of Egyptian night! Believe this who will, I must have stronger evidence of its correctness than I have yet found in order to give it credit." But does Mr. Stuart think the Hebrews, the people of God, believed in the doctrine of *transmigration of souls*?

3d, But Mr. Stuart forgets himself. We shall see

afterwards, that he furnishes us with evidence that the Egyptians in the midst of their *night* knew all about future rewards and punishments, and yet he cannot show, that the Hebrews, the people of God, did know this, or that it is taught in the Old Testament. Now, how will he, or any other man, be able to account for the indisputable fact, that the Egyptians taught this doctrine in the days of Moses and the prophets, yet he never taught it in his writings? If Moses was better informed than the Egyptians on this subject, as Mr. Stuart asserts, how happened it, that he gave us no information on the subject? But

4th, Mr. Stuart adds—"I regard the simple meaning of this controverted place (and of others like it, e. g. Ps. vi. 5; xxx. 9; lxxxviii. 11; cxv. 17; Comp. cxviii. 17), as being this, viz. "the dead can no more give thanks to God, nor celebrate his praise, among the living on earth, and thus cause his name to be glorified by them," or thus do him honor before them. So the sequel of Isai. xxxviii. 18; "the living, the living, he shall praise thee; as I do this day: the father to the children shall make known thy truth, i. e. thy faithfulness." This last clause makes the whole plain; and one is ready to wonder, that so much skepticism about the views of the Hebrews in regard to a future state of existence, could have been eked out of the verse in question." No man disputes with Mr. Stuart, that "the dead can no more give thanks to God, nor celebrate his praises, among the living on earth." What he has got to prove, is, that the *dead* celebrate God's praises in *Sheol*; that there people have *powers and capacities* to do this. What scripture writer asserts this? If he cannot produce scripture authority for this, is it not rash to assert it?

Isai. lvii. 9. "And thou didst debase thyself even unto hell, (*Sheol*)." *Sheol* here evidently means *grave*; and to be debased even unto *Sheol*, *Hades*, or the *grave* expresses the lowest state of debasement, or degradation,



Ezek. xxxi. 15. "In the day when he went down to the grave, (*Sheol*) I caused a mourning." The prophet is here speaking of the death of the king of Egypt; and *Sheol* is correctly rendered *grave* by our translators. See on the next passage.

Ezek. xxxi. 16. "I made the nations to shake at the sound of his fall, when I cast him down to *hell*, (*Sheol*)." But why is *Sheol* rendered *hell* here, and *grave* in the verse preceding, for the prophet has not changed his subject? This is a striking example, of the inconsistency in the translators, as to their translation of *Sheol*. But there are also many other examples, the reader may notice.

Ezek. xxxi. 17. "They also went down into *hell* (*Sheol*) with him, unto them that be slain with the sword." The same subject is continued, as in the two preceding verses already noticed, and *grave* ought to have been the rendering of *Sheol*.

Ezek. xxxii. 21. "The Strong among the mighty shall speak to him out of the midst of *hell*, (*Sheol*), with them that help him." This is spoken of the King of Egypt, and is similar to that said Isai. xiv. 9—20, concerning the King of Babylon, above noticed. This is one of the texts, which Mr. Stuart considers the language of poetry. See in Isai. xiv. 9—20, above.

Ezek. xxxii. 27. "And they shall not lie with the mighty that are fallen of the uncircumcised, which are gone down to *hell*, (*Sheol*), with their weapons of war; and they have laid their swords under their heads." *Grave, vault, or tomb* is the meaning of *Sheol* here; for do people carry their weapons of war with them to *hell*, the world of woe? and, do they lay them under their heads there? The allusion is evidently to the custom of burying the hero's implements of war with him. Another text which is only the language of poetry. See Isai. xiv. 9—20 above.

Hosea xiii. 14. "I will ransom them from the power

of the grave (*sheol*); I will redeem them from death; O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave (*Sheol*), I will be thy destruction." If *Sheol* does mean *hell, the world of woe*, it is here plainly declared, that it is to be destroyed. But if it means *grave*, this is agreeable to scripture, for death and the grave are to be destroyed, when men are raised from the dead immortal and glorious. There is a double antithesis in this passage, which show *Sheol* means *grave*. The first member of the verse, is explained by the second; and the fourth member is explained by the third, *Sheol* in the first and fourth members, answers to death in the second and third.

Amos ix. 2. "Though they dig into hell (*Sheol*) thence shall mine hand take them." People may dig down into the lowest grave. But can any person dig down to *Sheol*, if it means *the world of woe, hell* in the common acceptation of this term? If it does mean this in any instance, it is here supposed men may dig into it. But can any man seriously believe this? Besides, *hell* after all, must be a region beneath peopled with ghosts, Mr Stuart's skepticism on the subject to the contrary notwithstanding.

Jonah ii. 2. "Out of the belly of hell (*Sheol*) cried I, and thou heardest my voice." But how could Jonah be in *hell, the world of woe*, for he was only in the belly of the fish. He thought his situation, the same as if he had been in the grave. And, unless there are two or more *Sheols* or *hells*, how can it mean both *grave* and *world of woe*, for all at death go to *Sheol*.

Such are all the places where *Sheol* occurs, in whatever way rendered in our common English version. The examples of its usage are numerous; but numerous as they are, I do not find that in a single instance *Sheol* is used to designate *hell, the world of woe*. To this conclusion I have come, after patient and repeated investigations of the subject. Mr. Stuart's attempt to es-

tablish a contrary conclusion, only confirms me in my own. Indeed, the result of his examination, leaves his mind doubtful as to the truth of his conclusion, that *Sheol* does mean *hell* in the common use of this word. Let us hear him, respecting the result at which he arrives?

He says, p. 93—"There can be no reasonable doubt, that *Sheol* does most generally mean the *under-world, the grave or sepulchre, the world of the dead*, in the Old Testament scriptures. It is very clear that there are many passages, where no other meaning can reasonably be assigned to it. Accordingly our English translators have rendered the word *Sheol* grave, in thirty instances out of the whole sixty-four instances in which it occurs in the Hebrew scriptures. In many of the remaining cases, where they have given a different version of the word, i. e. translated it *hell*, it is equally clear that it should have been rendered, *grave or region of the dead*. This has been clearly shown, by producing the instances in the above exhibition of examples. In *three cases*, they have recognised the same principle, (at least this seems to have been their view), viz. Numb. xvi. 30, 33. Job xvii. 16, where it is translated pit. In regard to most of the cases in which they have rendered the word *hell*, it may be doubtful whether they meant thereby to designate *the world of future torment*. The incongruity of such a rendering, at least in not a few cases, has been already pointed out, in the citations of the respective examples above, and therefore need not be here repeated. The inconstancy with which they have sometimes rendered the word *Sheol*, in the same connection and with the same sense, is a striking circumstance, which cannot but be regarded with some wonder by an attentive inquirer. Nor is this always to be attributed to *different translators*, (who are known to have been employed in making the English version); but the *same* translator has

been occasionally inconsistent with himself; e. g. Ezek. xxxi. 15, compared with Ezek. xxxi; 16, 17."

Such are Mr. Stuart's own frank confessions respecting the term *Sheol*; and how far the result of his investigations differs from mine, let the reader judge. But it will no doubt be said, does not professor Stuart contend, that there are at least five texts, "*in which Sheol may designate the world of woe?*" We answer yes; but let us now see the result of his investigation of them? As the conclusion of this whole matter, he says p. 114,—“The sum of the evidence from the Old Testament in regard to Sheol, is, that the Hebrews did probably, in some cases, connect with the use of this word, the idea of misery subsequent to the death of the body.” Mr Stuart puts these words in capital letters, no doubt to make them the more conspicuous. But with or without this parade of capitals, it is conspicuous enough, that all he contends for is, a mere *probability*, that Sheol *in some cases* does mean what he says it does. Or rather, “The Hebrews did probably in some cases, connect with the use of this word, the idea of misery subsequent to the death of the body.” It is obvious, this *probability*, is not founded on the original signification of the term *Shoel*; its general scripture usage; or the five texts which he deemed most to his purpose. No; he allows *Sheol* originally signified the grave or state of the dead; and that the general usage of Sheol is in favor of my views, is obvious from his own statements. Besides, the five texts on which he places his dependence, are susceptible of a different interpretation from the one he has given them, by his own confession. It will then be asked, on what does Mr. Stuart found his *probability* that Sheol in some texts means *hell, the world of woe?* We answer, it is founded on assertions; begging the question of his readers; and principally on the following assumption—that



the Hebrews in some cases, when they used the term *Sheol*, had in their minds the idea of *future punishment*. But, he has not produced a single text to show, that they had such an idea in their minds, and we are confident he is unable to produce it.

Mr. Stuart showed his *sagacity*, in making some shew of defending the doctrine of future punishment, from the term *Sheol*. This, is the foundation of the whole superstructure of punishment after death. If it gives way, the whole falls to irrecoverable ruin. If a *Tartarus* is not found in *Sheol*, it cannot be found in *Hades* its corresponding word in the Greek, except on heathen authority. And we shall see on Mr. Stuart's own authority, Gehenna did not originally mean *Tartarus*, but came through a superstitious notion, to designate *hell the world of woe*. This *Tartarus*, this *world of woe*, was first invented by men, and then terms were invented, or words had new senses affixed to them, to designate it. It would be alarming, frankly to state, that *Sheol* had no *Tartarus* in it. People would naturally ask—had the ancient Hebrews no *hell*, no *world of woe*? And the conclusion would soon come to be drawn, why should we have one? Of course, it is of the last importance to contend, the Hebrews had a *Tartarus* in their *Sheol*, for if this was abandoned, no other word, no other text in the Old Testament, furnishes the shadow of a foundation for it.

The reader must have noticed, that in the texts above, *Sheol* is often rendered by the word *hell*, which to most ears, conveys the sound of terror and dismay. But he has also seen, that the word *hell*, in its original signification, conveyed no such terror. Mr. Stuart confesses, that in a great many instances, it is a very improper rendering of *Sheol*. Let us hear him a little farther respecting the word *hell*. He says, pp. 113, 114—"On the whole, it is to be regretted that our English translation has given occasion to the remarks, that

those who made it have intended to impose on their readers, in any case, a sense different from that of the original Hebrew. The inconstancy with which they have rendered the word *Sheol*, even in cases of the same nature, must obviously afford some apparent ground for this objection against their version of it. But I cannot persuade myself, that men of so much integrity as the translators plainly were, and, I may add, of so much critical skill and acumen also, would undertake to mislead their readers in any point, where it is so easy to make corrections. I am much more inclined to believe, that in their day the word *hell* had not acquired, so exclusively as at present, the meaning of *world of future misery*. There is plain evidence of this, in what is called the Apostles creed; which says of Christ, (after his crucifixion), that he descended into *hell*! surely the *Protestant* English Church did not mean to aver that the soul of Christ went to the *world of woe*; nor that it went to *Purgatory*. They did not believe either of these doctrines. *Hell* then means, in this document, the *under-world, the world of the dead*. And so it has been construed, by the most intelligent critics of the English Church. With this view of the meaning of the word *hell*, as employed in past times, we may easily account for it, why it has been so often employed as the translation of *Sheol*. This view of the subject, also, enables us to acquit the translators of any collusion in regard to this word; and to acquit them in this respect, does seem to be an act of simple justice, due to their ability, their integrity, and uprightness."

Mr. Stuart here makes a very handsome apology, for the translators of our common version. "In their day the word *hell* had not acquired, so exclusively as at present, the meaning of *world of future misery*." In proof of this he very properly refers to the use of this term in the Apostles creed; and might also have appeal-

ed to the marginal readings, in our English translation. But we have two or three remarks to make about this. 1st, Who has been so kind, as to make *world of future misery* the *exclusive* sense of *hell*, since the common translation was made? for now, it is used in no other sense but this. We have been improving the wrong way since that period, for 2d, I ask, why should *hell* have the sense of “*world of future misery*” at all, for certainly this was not its original signification, as is allowed by Dr. Campbell, Parkhurst, and many others. Who then first gave to this word such a meaning? Not God, but probably the poets gave a similar sense to this term as to Hades. But 3d, Is it correct, is it honest, to attach such a new sense to the term *hell*, making it a bugbear to frighten women, and children, and men who know no better? This subject, if it was only generally examined, would put an end to people’s terrors about *eternal hell torments*. The confessions of Mr. Stuart, will help to open people’s eyes, that *hell*, is not exactly what they have supposed it to be.

I have now finished, what Dr. Campbell called an *endless labor*, namely, to illustrate by an enumeration of all the passages in the Old Testament where *Sheol* is found, that it does not designate *hell*, in the common usage of this term. I shall briefly advert to some facts and observations which have occurred to me in my examination of the above passages.

1st, In no passage is *Sheol* represented as a place of *fire or torment*. Nothing of this kind stands connected with it in the Old Testament. It is frequently represented as a place of *darkness, silence, ignorance, insensibility*, but never as a place of pain and misery, arising from torment by fire. But how happens this to be the case, if there was in the Hebrew *Sheol* a *Tartarus*, as Mr. Stuart supposes, for all know Tartarus is represented as a place of fire and torment. So he represents his *hell*, for he calls it “the lake of fire.” And

also positively asserts—"That in hades, Sheol, according to the views of the Hebrews, there was a place of torment." But from no text in which Sheol occurs, does he attempt to shew a vestige of evidence for such an assertion. No evidence for this can be produced. On the contrary, it will be shewn afterwards, how the *later* Hebrews came to include in *Sheol* a *Tartarus*, which reflects no great honor on the doctrine of hell torments, for which Mr. Stuart contends.

2d, It is an indisputable fact, that *oulm* rendered *everlasting*, for *ever*, etc. is never connected with *Sheol* in any shape whatever. For example, you never read of and *everlasting Sheol or hell*. So far from this, we are told Sheol is to be destroyed, Hos. xiii. 14. But supposing we did read of an *everlasting Sheol*, and everlasting punishment in it, this would not prove either of endless duration, for this term is often applied to things, yea to punishment not of endless duration, as shown in my second Inquiry. Mr. Stuart does not pretend, that *endless* punishment is taught in the Old Testament. But if the doctrine be true, as he asserts, why is it not taught in the Old Testament, and taught with as much plainness and frequency, as it is by modern preachers? An *eternal hell* and *everlasting fire* there, are common talk now? But why was there no *everlasting fire* in the Hebrew *Sheol*? Why was not it eternal? for Mr. Stuart says There was a *Tartarus* in it. But Mr. Stuart must be sensible, that *Sheol* in no instance, is ever represented as a place of punishment, either by *fire* or any thing else. And why should it, for

3d, No persons are said to be alive in *Sheol*, to be punished in any way, or by any means whatever. The only texts, which speak of persons as alive in *Sheol*, Mr. Stuart positively declares are only the language of poetry, they have a fictitious or imaginary costume. And no other text has he adduced, or can he adduce, to show that *Sheol* is a receptacle of souls or any living

beings, bodied or disembodied, rational or irrational. On the contrary, we are told without distinction or qualification, there "is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol." Eccles. ix. 10. It is represented as a place of insensibility—"for the dead know not any thing." And this perfectly accounts for Hezekiah saying—"The grave (Sheol) cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." If men are not alive in Sheol, how can they suffer misery there, either by fire or any thing else? How can they either praise God or curse him? How can they be either in happiness or misery? But if there was in the Hebrew Sheol, a *Tartarus*, as Mr. Stuart positively asserts, he is bound to tell us, why no sacred writer speaks as if there was any fire there, for he well knows Tartarus was a place of fire. He must also inform us, why the sacred writers avoid telling us persons are alive in Sheol, to suffer in his Tartarus there? Yea he must name the text, where he thinks *Sheol* included his Tartarus in it.

4th, Another fact is, the Old Testament writers and modern christians, speak very differently about *Sheol* and hell, if both designate the same thing, and include in them a place of future punishment. I shall merely give a specimen of their disagreement. Notice then 1st, How the inspired writers in those days, and good men in these, speak about Sheol or hell, in regard to *themselves*. Jacob, Job, and others, speak of going to hell, and expecting it as a thing of course, which they could not avoid. Yea, Job, prays to be hid in hell. I need not be more particular, for the texts above show, what were the views and feelings of the very best of men in those days about this. But I ask, is there a Christian in the world, who, in the present day speaks, and prays about hell, as those Old Testament saints did? But why not? The reason, I think is obvious. In those days Sheol or hell, did not as in these, signify a



place of punishment, but the state of the dead. In these days, when Christians speak about hell, they always mean a place of endless misery for the wicked. The obvious reason of such difference is, that we have affixed a very different sense to this word from what they did. If we are to understand the Scriptures correctly, we must ascertain what sense the original writers attached to the words they used, without regarding the sense men may have given them, since Revelation was completed. What right have we, or any one else, to alter the sense of the words used by the Holy Spirit?

2d, How the inspired writers in those days, and pious people in these, speak about hell to *the wicked*. Not an instance can I find, where it is intimated, that any such went to hell, a place of misery. Both good and bad went to *Sheol*, but not a word is said, that this was such a place as people now think hell to be. If the Old Testament saints entertained the same ideas about hell, as most Christians do in our day, I wish some person would rationally and scripturally account to me also for the following facts.

1st, *If their belief was the same as in our day, why do we never find them express that belief about eternal punishment, as is now done in books, and sermons, and conference meetings, and in common conversation.* No man can possibly deny the vast difference between their language, and the common language now used upon this subject. If the language is so different, is it not a proof, that this invention of new language arose from the unscriptural doctrine that hell was a place of endless misery? An unscriptural doctrine always gives rise to unscriptural language; for the words of Scripture, are the very best which could be chosen to express the will of God to men. That doctrine is not of God, or the man who contends for it, has a wrong view of it, who thinks, that the words of Scripture are not sufficiently definite in expressing it. The man who can

find similar ideas, and similar language in the Old Testament, as are in common use in our day about a place of eternal misery, must have read his Bible with more attention than I have done. After repeated and careful perusals of it, I frankly confess my inability to find either such ideas or language. I ask then, if the Old Testament writers had any such ideas, why did they not express them? I ask further, if they never expressed such ideas, how do we know that they had them?

2d, *How is it to be accounted for, that the fears and feelings and exertions of good people under the old dispensation, were so different from the fears and feelings, and exertions of Christians in our day, about saving men from hell?* It was no object of fear, of feeling, or of exertion in those days. In these, it is the *ultimate object*, of the fears and feelings and exertions of the religious community. To begin with their fears; I do not find that they express any, and it is fair to conclude that they had none. If they had any fears, I have no doubt that on some occasion or other they would have expressed them. As I do not find them expressed, I cannot produce any examples of their fears about their children, their relations, their neighbors, or the world at large, going to eternal misery.—As to their feelings, I do not find a sigh heaved, a tear shed, a groan uttered, a prayer offered, nor any exertions made, as if they believed men were exposed to endless misery in a future state. We see parents, and others, deeply affected at the loss of their children and friends by death. We see pious people deeply grieved on account of their disobedience to God's laws, but where do we find any expressions of feeling, arising from their belief, that such persons would lift up their eyes in endless misery? I find nothing of the kind expressed, either in the way of anticipation before death, or after such persons had been removed from the world. Now, is it not strange, that all this should be the state of the fears and feelings

of good people, if they did believe endless misery was to be the portion of the wicked? The whole race of mankind is swept from the earth by a flood, Noah and his family excepted; but, does this good man deplore, in any shape, that so many precious souls should be sent to hell? God also destroyed the cities of the plain: Abraham intercedes that they might be spared, but used no argument with God, that the people must go to hell to suffer eternal misery. Now, suffer me to ask, if Abraham believed this doctrine, is it possible he should have failed to urge it as an argument, that all those wicked persons must go to hell, if God destroyed them? No notice is taken of the very argument, which in our day, would be most urged in prayer to God, if any thing similar was to take place. All who have read the Old Testament know, what vast numbers were cut off in a day, by war and pestilence, and other means, yet do you ever hear it deplored by a single individual, as it is often done in our day, that so many were sent out of the world to eternal misery? If, in short, this doctrine was then believed, a dead silence and the most stoical apathy were maintained even by good men about it.

Under the Old Testament dispensation, the sinful condition of the heathen nations, is often spoken about. But do we ever find the inspired writers representing those nations as all going to eternal misery, or did they use similar exertions to save them from it as are used in the present day? If the doctrine of eternal misery was known and believed in those days, is it not very unaccountable, that so many ages should pass away, before God commanded the Gospel to be preached to every creature, and before those who knew their danger, should use exertions to save them from it? If the doctrine be false, we may cease to wonder at this, but if it be true, it is not easy to reconcile these things with the well known character of God, and the feelings of every good man. What an immense multitude of hu-

man beings, during four thousand years, must have lived and died ignorant that such a place of misery awaited them in a future state. It is evident, that both Jews and Gentiles, during the above period, were often threatened with, yea, suffered temporal punishment. God raised up, and sent prophets to warn them of his judgments against them. I am then totally at a stand, what to say, in justification of God's character, the character of the prophets sent by him, yea, of all good men in those days, that, knowing eternal misery awaited every heathen, yea, every wicked Jew, that nothing should be said to them on this subject. Jonah was sent to Nineveh, and the sum of his message was,—“yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown.” But did he receive, or did he deliver any message to them, that their souls were in danger of eternal misery? No; and every one who has read the Old Testament knows, that this is only a single example from many more I might adduce. The very reason why Jonah refused to go to Nineveh was, he knew that God was a merciful God, and would spare Nineveh. After he did go, his pride was hurt, because God did not destroy the city as he had predicted. His peevish disposition was sufficiently manifested about this; but not a word escapes him, that the Ninevites were exposed to endless punishment. I ask, can a single instance be produced from the Old Testament, where a prophet of the Lord, was ever sent to any people to warn them against eternal misery in a place called *Sheol* or *hell*? I do not find, that either true or false prophets did so under that dispensation, or that this doctrine was known and believed by a single individual. As men were not threatened with such a punishment, so none were ever congratulated as being saved from it. As it was never held up to deter men from sin while ignorant of God, so it was never urged on believers to stimulate them to gratitude and obedience. Is it possible then, that this doctrine

could be believed, yet all remain silent on the subject? If no revelation was given about it, how could men avoid such a punishment? If a revelation was given, how is it accounted for, that it is not mentioned by one of the Old Testament writers? If it is mentioned by any of them under any other name than *Sheol*, I am ignorant of it; nor is this even pretended by those who believe the doctrine.

3d, *Another fact deserving notice, is, that the living in speaking of their dead friends, never speak as if they were to be separated from them after death, but always as associated with them.* This appears to have been the case, whether the persons were good or bad. An instance to the contrary, cannot be produced, where a person ever expressed himself, as if he expected after death to be separated, and separated from his friends forever. But it is well known, that persons in our day, not only expect to be separated from many of their friends forever, but say, they shall give their hearty amen to their everlasting condemnation. Yea, it is even said, that the happiness of those in heaven, is to be greatly enhanced, by their looking down on those in eternal torments, in seeing the smoke of it ascend forever and ever. This was once current popular divinity, and though not yet altogether out of use, yet I am happy to say, sober-minded men reject it. But, it may be asked, is it true, that persons under the Old Testament expected to be associated with their deceased friends after death? I do not recollect a single instance to the contrary, and shall here, in proof of the assertion, refer to Jahn's *Biblical Archæology*, p. 234. To this it may probably be objected, that association with their friends after death, only referred to their bodies mingling in the dust together, and had no reference to their *spirits* after death. Admitting this to be true, permit me to ask, can any proof be adduced, that their *spirits* were separated from each other after death? I



further ask, did their *spirits* exist in a state of either happiness or misery after death? I demand proof of this. As I am unable to adduce any proof, I request those who say so, to produce evidence of this from the Old Testament. I shall give it all due consideration. At any rate, if the Old Testament is silent on the subject, it ill becomes us to assert that such was the case. Its very silence, is to me an indication, that no such idea was entertained in those days. If it was, it is somewhat surprising that no person ventured to express it. And if it is not expressed by any of the Old Testament writers, how is it known that such an idea was entertained by them.

In concluding this investigation of the term Sheol, we shall briefly notice the following objections.

1st, Does not David intimate his child was alive somewhere after death, when he says—"I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." 2 Sam. xi. 23. To this we answer no. David no more says his child was alive, than Joseph was after death when his father said—"I will go down into *Sheol* unto my son mourning." But let me ask, where did those parents suppose their children were after death? In hell? Surely not, for why were they in this case desirous to go to them? If there, well might Jacob say he would go down to Joseph *mourning*. Were they then in heaven? If so, Jacob ought to have said he would go down to Joseph *rejoicing*. But if in heaven, why did he speak of going down to him, for people always speak of going up to heaven. Where then did David and Jacob suppose their children had gone? I answer to *Sheol*; the house appointed for all the living. Job xxx. 33; the place Solomon refers to, when he says, "all go to one place." Eccl. xii. 23. All, good or bad, went to *Sheol*. Psal. lxxxix. 48. This was the world of the dead; and the small and the great are there. There the wicked cease from troubling; there the weary be

at rest, Job 3d. David knew his child had gone there ; and impressed with his own mortality he says—  
 “I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me.”

2d, It may be objected—when Samuel said to Saul—“to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me,” does he not intimate he was alive somewhere after death ; and, his conversing with Saul a proof of it. To this we answer no ; for he that believes it, must take Saul and his sons to heaven, for no one believes Samuel went to *hell*. Moreover, he must believe, that a woman had power to bring a departed spirit out heaven. But we have shown in Essays, sect. 2d, that this woman was an imposter. The popular notion was, that *Sheol* was a deep region in the earth, where the ghosts of the dead all resided. This woman’s trade was to consult with the dead, and for this purpose Saul resorted to her. But all such superstitious practices God condemned, and expressly prohibited the Jews from giving any countenance to them. It is strange, Christians in the nineteenth century, should suppose there was any truth in them. We have seen above, Professor Stuart says—“a deep region beneath, peopled with ghosts, is what we do not believe in.”

3d, It may be objected—future existence was not known under the Old Testament ; and if its silence on the subject of endless misery proves it false, it is also proved, there is no future existence. Answer. We admit the force of this argument, if it can be proved the Old Testament is silent on the subject of future existence. But this, we are surprised, that any man should aver ; but it would be aside from our present design, to discuss this point. See Jahn’s Bib. Arche. sect. 314. We doubt, if this would ever be denied, except for the purpose of getting rid of the stumbling argument, that the Old Testament does not teach the doctrine of endless punishment. Endless punishment it does not teach, and rather than abandon it, some are willing to allow, future existence is not taught there.

4th, It may be further objected—if men are at death reduced to dust, lose their powers and personal identity, and for a time cease to be susceptible of either enjoyment or suffering, why may not this state continue for ever? What reason have we to hope, that their powers and personal identity will ever be restored? To this I answer, God has promised man a future and an immortal life by a resurrection from the dead; and the example and pledge of it, is given in Christ's resurrection from the dead. No man will deny this, who regards the authority of the scriptures; or doubts its accomplishment, until he doubts the truth of divine revelation, and the power of God to affect it. But to doubt the competency of God's power to restore to man his powers and personal identity, is not doubting enough. The man who doubts this, ought also to doubt, the competency of his power to create man at first with such powers and personal identity. Creating at first, and a resurrection from the dead, are both ascribed to the power of God in scripture. If I am asked—"how are the dead raised up? And with what body do they come?" I refer the reader to 1 Cor. xv: 36—50 for the answer.

To conclude. It is now generally conceded, by all critics and intelligent men, that *endless* punishment was not taught under the *first covenant*. But it is generally believed to be taught under the *new* and *better covenant*. If this is true, how can it be called a *better covenant*, and "*established upon better promises?*" Is endless punishment a better promise? And was it the fault in the first covenant, which required the second and better covenant, that it did not teach the doctrine of endless punishment? But if all this be true, how is Christ the mediator of a *better covenant*? If endless punishment, is not threatened in the law which came by Moses, how can it be threatened in the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ? If it is not heard

in the thunders, fire, and tempest of mount Sinai, who can think it is to be heard from mount Zion?

---

## SECTION II.

ALL THE TEXTS, IN WHICH HADES OCCURS CONSIDERED.

ALL critics are agreed, that the Greek *Hades* in the New Testament, corresponds in meaning to the Hebrew *Sheol* in the old. In the septuagint version, the translators have rendered the term *Sheol*, 60 times by the word *Hades*, out of the 64 instances where it occurs. *Hades*, also occurs 16 times in the apocryphal books, and is used in a similar way, as the Hebrew *Sheol* is, in the canonical writings of the Old Testament. Besides, the New Testament writers in quoting from the Old, use *Hades*, as the rendering of *Sheol*, in the passages they cite, see Ps. xvi. 10. compared with Acts ii. 27, etc.

The term *Hades*, occurs eleven times in the Greek of the New Testament. In the common version, it is once rendered *grave*, and in the other ten places by the word *hell*. The following are all the passages.

Math. xi. 23. "And thou Capernaum which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell, (*Hades*)."  
 Dr. Campbell, in the dissertation quoted above, says—"as the city of Capernaum was never literally raised to heaven, we have no reason to believe, that it was to be literally brought down to *Hades*. But as by the former expression we are given to understand, that it was to become a flourishing and splendid city, or as some think, that it had obtained great spiritual advantages; so by the latter, that it should be brought to the lowest degree of abasement and wretchedness." See

on Isai. vii. 9. above, where *Sheol* is used in a similar sense. This text has often been quoted to prove, that all<sup>1</sup> who have abused spiritual privileges, shall be brought down to *hell*, or *endless misery*.

Math. xvi. 18. "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell, (Hades), shall not prevail against it." Dr. Campbell says—"it is by death, and by it only, the spirit enters into Hades. The gates of Hades is therefore a very natural periphrasis for death." But this is not altogether in unison, with what the Dr. has said elsewhere concerning Hades: and, we shall see in the sequel from Dr. Whitby, that Hades is not a *resceptacle of souls*, or *spirits*. This was not believed by the ancient Hebrews, but was a mere heathen notion. Certainly, no text in the Bible says, "it is by death the *spirit* enters into Hades," or speaks of *souls*, or *spirits* being there.

Luke x. 15. "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to Hell, (Hades)." See on Math. xi. 23. above. This is only the parallel text to it, and has there been considered.

Luke xvi. 23. "And in hell, (Hades), he lifted up his eyes being in torment." As this is the *only* text in which Hades occurs, where it is alledged, it signifies *hell the world of woe*, we shall give it a full consideration. The following, are all the remarks which Mr. Stuart makes on this passage. "That in the heathen Hades was a *Tartarus*, a place of punishment and suffering, is too well known to need illustration and proof on the present occasion. More will be said on this point, when I come to treat of Tartarus. That in Hades, *Sheol*, according to the views of the Hebrews, and of Jesus himself, there was a *place of torment*, is put out of all question by the passage now before us." All this is *mere assertion*, but as it comes from Mr. Stuart, we shall examine it. Let us inquire.

1st, was the *Tartarus* in the heathen Hades *real*, or



was it *fictitious*? This question ought to be fully examined, for if it was *fictitious*, the mere *fancy of the poets*, Mr. Stuart's *hell* is built on the sand. But he is so confident, it was a *reality*, he says, "that in the heathen Hades was a Tartarus, a place of *punishment* and suffering, is too well known to need illustration and proof on the present occasion." We are surprised that he should take this bold ground, for we shall show from his own statements, the heathen *Tartarus* was a mere *fiction*. Sorry are we to think, he should allege, our Lord in this passage sanctioned a heathen fable for truth. That *Tartarus* was a mere heathen fable, and had its origin in heathenism, we shall now show.

Cicero, one of the wisest men among the heathen, in his seventh oration says—"For it was on this account that the ancients invented their infernal punishments of the dead, to keep the wicked under some awe in this life, who without them would have no dread of death itself." Intelligent heathens, had no more faith in infernal punishments, than people now have in the Salem witchcraft. See my letters to Mr. Hudson, pp. 266, 267, where I have quoted Mosheim, who says, such punishments were invented for state and military purposes. See also the next section.

But as Mr. Stuart will not dispute his own testimony, let us see what he has said elsewhere about *Tartarus*. After describing *Cimmeria* as an *imaginary* place, and *Erebus* as no better, though contiguous to Hades, he thus describes it. "Last and lowest of all, was Hades, which is subdivided into the upper and lower. In the upper part are the *Elysian fields*, the abode of the good; and beneath these, i. e. in the deepest dungeon, in the bowels of the earth, is Tartarus the place of punishment for the wicked, answering in some respects, to the Gehenna of the Hebrews. Hades, then, in the view of the Greeks and Romans was the *under-world*, *the world of the dead*, a place deep in the earth, dark,

cheerless; where every thing was unsubstantial and shadowy. The Manes were neither body nor spirit; but something intermediate, not palpable to any of the senses, except to the sight and hearing; pursuing the mere shadows of their occupations on earth, and incapable of any plans, enjoyments, or satisfaction which were substantial." Exeget. Essays, pp. 124—128. Such is the heathen *Hades*, and its *Tartarus*, as described by Mr. Stuart himself. This *Tartarus* he avers, Jesus sanctions as *real* in the passage in question. But, did Jesus convert a heathen *fable* into truth? Did the heathens invent a *hell* for him? But let us look at this *Hades* or *hell*? If we ask where is *Hades*? It is answered in the above quotation—"it is a place deep in the earth." And if it is asked what is the use of this *Hades*? It is answered, it is—"the abode of departed souls." Again; if we ask how is it divided? It is answered—"it is subdivided into the upper and lower. In the upper part are the *Elysian fields*, the abode of the good; and beneath these, i. e. in the deepest dungeon, in the bowels of the earth, is *Tartarus*, the place of punishment for the wicked, answering in some respects, to the *Gehenna* of the Hebrews." But Mr. Stuart must have forgotten, that he told us above—"a deep region beneath peopled with ghosts, is what we do not believe in." It is a great mistake, to say, *Tartarus* answers in some respects to the *Gehenna* of the Hebrews, if by *Hebrews* he means the *ancient Jews*, or the sacred writers. Not a trace of *Tartarus* is to be found in the Old Testament, nor, do the writers ever use *Gehenna* in the sense of *Tartarus*, as all must allow.

But the principal question to be decided here, is—was *Tartarus* *real* or *imaginary*? Mr. Stuart, is confident it is a reality. The fact he considers so well known, as to save him all trouble, of giving proof or illustration of it. But here, he strangely forgot what he said, p. 126,—“Virgil in his *Æneid*, book vi. has given

a vivid picture of Orcus or Hades. It is more adapted, however, to convey the fancies of his own poetic imagination, than it is to convey an exact idea of the more ancient and general opinions of the Greeks in respect to Hades. He loses sight in some measure of the views of Homer, and is more intent on making out a *striking* picture, than on giving an exact account of tradition."

But again, he says p. 128—"Virgil describes the progress of Eneas in the region of Hades, in terms which show what a doleful place he thought it to be. However, when he brings his hero to Elysium, to the *locus laetos et amoena vireta, sedesque*, (vi. 637. seq). he seems to make something more substantial out of them, than can be found in any of the preceding heathen writers. But it is plainly the *fancy of the poet* which does this, and not the tradition of the Greek and Roman nations." On the same page he adds—"of the Elysium of Virgil, Homer knows little or nothing; and it is sufficiently plain, that it is principally the offspring of his own imagination." But if all this be the *fancy of the poet, the offspring of his own imagination*, why did Mr. Stuart say above—"that in the heathen Hades was a *Tartarus*, a place of punishment and suffering, is too well known to need illustration and proof on the present occasion?" He would have said the truth, and maintained consistency in his statements, had he said—"that in the heathen Hades was a *Tartarus* which was the *fancy of the poet, the offspring of his own imagination*. But, he assumes the heathen *Tartarus* to be a *reality*, and declares that Jesus taught it in the parable before us.

I shall now proceed to show, from other writings, approved by Mr. Stuart, that this *Tartarus* was of heathen origin. It is well known Mr. Isaac Stuart, his son, lately translated from the French, J. M. Greppo's Essay on the Hieroglyphic system of M. Champollion

junior. He and his father, have added notes and illustrations to this work, which furnishes the following information on this subject. See all they have said, in notes M. and N. a part of which I shall quote. In note M. p. 232, it is thus written.

“Osiris was the chief God of the Egyptian *amenti*, answering to the Pluto of the Greeks and Latins. It is sufficient for our purpose to know where his dominion was exercised. This was over the souls of men after their decease—a fact which is revealed by almost every legend and painting relating to the dead. The *Amenti* of the Egyptians, corresponding to the Hades of the Greeks and to the Tartarus of the Latins, was *the place of the dead*. It was governed by Osiris as chief, and by many subordinate divinities.” On this I remark

1st, It is confessed—“the *Amenti* of the Egyptians, corresponded to the *Hades* of the Greeks, and to the *Tartarus* of the Latins.” But why not also confess, it corresponds to the *hell* of Christians? Mr. Stuart identifies his *hell* with the heathen *Tartarus*, and of course with the Egyptian *Amenti*.

2d, If “Osiris was the chief God of the Egyptian *Amenti*, answering to the Pluto of the Greeks and Latins,” is not the Devil the chief God in the *hell* of Christians? Let us ask—where was the dominion of Osiris and Pluto exercised? It is answered in the above quotation—“this was over the souls of men after their decease.” And is not this the very dominion, which Christians assign to their Devil? Is not his dominion over the souls of men after their decease? Is not he represented, as the chief God, or ruler in their hell? And if it be, “a fact, which is revealed by almost every legend and painting relating to the dead,” among the Egyptians, that this was the proper dominion of their Osiris, does not almost every tract and sermon among Christians, reveal, that hell is the proper dominion of the Devil? In a word—who can well de-

ny, that the Devil among Christians, answers the same purposes to them, that Osiris did to the Egyptians, and Pluto to the Greeks and Latins?

But again, in pp. 235, 236, the following account of an Egyptian burial, is quoted from Spineto. Mr. Stuart assigns this reason for the quotation. "We quote the whole, as it shows from whence an important part of the Greek mythology was derived." It runs thus—"the common place of burial was beyond the lake *Acherjsia*, or *Acharejish* which meant *the last state, the last condition of man*, and from which the poets have imagined the fabulous lake of *Acheron*. On the borders of this lake *Acherjsia* sat a tribunal, composed of forty-two judges, whose office, previous to the dead being permitted to be carried to the cemetery beyond the lake, was to inquire into the whole conduct of his life.

If the deceased had died insolvent, they adjudged the corpse to his creditors, which was considered as a mark of dishonor, in order to oblige his relations and friends to redeem it, by raising the necessary sums among themselves. If he had led a wicked life, they ordered that he should be deprived of solemn burial, and he was consequently carried and thrown into a large ditch made for the purpose, to which they gave the appellation of *Tartar*, on account of the lamentations that this sentence produced among his surviving friends and relations.

This is also the origin of the fabulous *Tartarus*, in which the poets have transferred the lamentations made by the living to the dead themselves who were thrown into it.

If no accuser appeared, or if the accusation had proved groundless, the judges decreed that the deceased was entitled to his burial, and his eulogium was pronounced amidst the applauses of the bystanders, in which they praised his education, his religion, his justice, in short, all his virtues, without, however, mention-



ing any thing about his riches or nobility, both of which were considered as mere gifts of fortune.

To carry the corpse to the cemetery, it was necessary to cross the lake, and this was done by means of a boat, in which no one could be admitted without the express order of the judges, and without paying a small sum for the conveyance. this regulation was so strictly enforced, that the kings themselves were not exempt from its severity.

The cemetery was a large plain surrounded by trees, and intersected by canals, to which they had given the appellation of *elisout*, or *elisiæns*, which means nothing else but *rest*. And such again is the origin of the poetical Charon and his boat, as well as of the fabulous description of the Elysian Fields."

But again, pp. 241, 242, it is said—"in comparing the Egyptian *Amenti* with the Hades of the Greeks and with the Tartarus of the Latins, Spineto briefly adverts to some points of assimilation, as follows; "Upon the whole, the first seems to have been the prototype and the origin of the two last. Orpheus, who had been initiated into all the secrets of the mysteries of Egypt, carried into Greece these mysteries;\* and the Greeks soon so altered the whole, as to render them no longer cognizable. Osiris became Pluto; Sme, Persephone [or rather Themis simply]; Oms, Cerberus; Thoth, Mercurius Psychopompos; Horus, Apis, and Anubis, the three infernal judges, Minos, Æacus, and Rhadamanthus. To conclude the whole, the symbolical heads of the different animals under which the forty-two judges were represented, being deprived of their primitive and symbolical meaning, were changed into real monsters, the Chimeras, the Harpies, and the Gorgons, and other

\* Any one who will take the trouble to compare the mysteries of Isis and Osiris with those of Ceres and Proserpine, with those of Venus and Adonis, and with those of Bacchus, will discover many striking resemblances.—TR.

such unnatural and horrible things, with which they peopled their fantastic hell; and thus the *Amenti* of the Egyptians, as indeed the greater part, if not the whole of their religion, became, in the hands of the Greeks and Romans, a compound of fables and absurdities."

It is very obvious from these quotations,

1st, That the Egyptian *Amenti*, became the *Hades* of the Greeks, and the *Tartarus* of the Latins. The first, the prototype and the origin of the two last. Mr. Stuart here, does not pretend that *Tartarus* had its origin in divine revelation. On the contrary, it is called the "*fabulous Tartarus*." Why then say it is a reality, and sanctioned by our Lord in the parable before us? *Tartarus* had just as little truth in it, as "*the fabulous lake Acheron*," the "*poetical charron and his boat*," or "*the ideal Elysian fields*." It is here admitted, *Tartarus*, or *hell*, had its origin in the Egyptian *Amenti*.

2d, We are told in the above quotations—"that Orpheus carried this knowledge of the Egyptian *Amenti*, or hell with other mysteries into Greece: and in the hands of the Greeks and Romans, it soon became a compound of fables and absurdities." Was it *truth*, I ask, which in the hands of the Greeks and Romans, "became a compound of fables and absurdities?" Surely not. It was only absurdities, which became more absurd. The Greeks and Romans, improved on the Egyptian *hell*, as they did on every thing else. And have not Christians adopted the Egyptian *hell*, with the Grecian and Roman improvements, yea have made some improvements of their own. The Grecian and Roman *hell*, is more like the Christian *hell*, than the original *Amenti* of the Egyptians. Does not Mr. Stuart aver, our Lord teaches a *Tartarus* in the parable before us, and is not this his *hell*?

3d, It seems now to be conceded, that the Egyptian

*Amenti*, is “the prototype and the origin of the *Hades* of the Greeks, the *Tartarus* of the Latins, and the *hell* of Christians.” Dr. Good in his book of nature, says —“it was believed in most countries, that this *hell*, *Hades*, or invisible world, is divided into two very distinct and opposite regions by a broad and impassable gulph; that the one is a seat of happiness, a paradise, or elysium, and the other a seat of misery, a *Gehenna*, or *Tartarus*; and that there is a supreme magistrate and an impartial tribunal belonging to the infernal shades, before which the ghosts must appear, and by which he is sentenced to the one or the other, according to the deeds done in the body. Egypt is said to have been the inventress of this important and valuable part of the common tradition; and, undoubtedly, it is to be found in the earliest records of Egyptian history.” The only question to be settled, is—Did the knowledge of this Egyptian *Amenti*, *hell*, or *invisible world*, come from God, or was it of man’s invention? If this question can be fairly determined, the *hell* of Christians stands or falls with it. Can it then be determined, that this *Amenti* or *hell* of the Egyptians, was of man’s invention? We answer yes, and that to a moral certainty. 1st, Dr. Good allows, Egypt was “the inventress” of this doctrine. Mr. Stuart admits this by his silence, for he does not intimate, it had its origin from God. 2d, what puts this out of all question is, Moses was brought up in Egypt; was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; consequently knew all about their *Amenti* or *hell*; yet, says not a word about it in his five books. But why was he silent on such an important doctrine, if he believed it came from God? What I ask, could prevent him from teaching it, except this—that *Egypt*, not *God* was the *inventress* of it, as Dr. Good affirms. If it is found in the earliest records of Egyptian history, as Dr. Good affirms, why is it not found in the earliest records of divine revelation, if the doctrine is from God?

Mr. Stuart indeed *asserts*, that there was a *Tartarus* in the Hebrew *Sheol*, but *assertions* will not answer on a subject of this nature. Dr. Campbell, Dr. Whitby, and others, adduce evidence in point blank contradiction of his assertion. The very silence of Moses and the prophets, about an *Amenti Tartarus*, or *hell*, shows no such doctrine was believed by them. See my *Essays*, and *Letters to Mr. Hudson*, where the origin and history of hell torments is stated at length, and how this doctrine came to be embraced by the Jews, and was finally introduced into the Christian Church. Further evidence of this will appear, by considering another question; namely

2d, Is it true, as Mr. Stuart asserts—"that in *Hades*, *Sheol*, according to the views of the Hebrews, and of Jesus himself, there is a *place of torment*, is put out of all question by the passage now before us." This assertion I shall now examine. It divides itself into two parts.—1st, It is asserted, "that in *Hades*, *Sheol*, according to the views of the *Hebrews* there was a *place of torment*, is put out of all question by the passage before us." If Mr. Stuart here by *Hebrews*, means the *ancient* Hebrews, the Scripture writers, his assertion is false. His own examination of *Sheol* sufficiently shows this, for not in a single text, did he show, that any Scripture writer believed, that in *Sheol* there was a place of torment. Dr. Whitby, in the following remarks on Acts ii. 27. proves the assertion false. He says—"that *Sheol* throughout the Old Testament, and *Hades* in the septuagint, answering to it, signify not the place of punishment, or of the souls of bad men only, but the grave only, or the place of death, appears—1st, From the root of it *Shaal*; which signifies to ask, to crave and require, because it *craves for all men*, Prov. xxx. 16. and will let no man escape its hands, Psal. lxxxviii. 48. It is that *Sheol* or *Hades*, whither, we are all going, Eccles. ix. 10.

2d, Because it is the place to which the good as well as the bad go, for they whose souls go upwards, descend into it. Thither went Jacob, Gen. xxxvii. 35. There Job desired to be, Chap. xiv. 13. for he knew that Sheol was his house, Chap. xvii. 13. and to descend into the dust was to descend into Hades. Is not death common to all men? Is not Hades the house of all men? Hezekiah expected to be there after he went hence, for he said "I shall go to the gates of Hades," Isai. xxxviii. 30. That is, saith Jerome, to those gates of which the Psalmist speaks, saying, "thou wilt lift me up from the gates of death." The ancient Greeks assigned one Hades to all that died, and therefore say, Hades receives all mortal men together, all men shall go to Hades.

"3d, Had the penmen of the Old Testament meant by Hades any receptacle of souls, they could not truly have declared, there was no wisdom, or knowledge in Sheol, Ecc. ix. 10. No remembrance of God there, Ps. vi. 5. No praising of him in Sheol, Isai. xxxviii. 18. For those heathens who looked upon it as the receptacle of souls, held it to be a place in which they would be punished or rewarded." Compare this with Mr. Stuart's assertion. It is, unquestionable, that *Hades* in its original signification, did not include in it a *Tartarus*, any more than *Sheol*. Dr. Campbell says—it signified—"obscure, hidden, invisible." So did the word *hell* originally." Dr. Whitby has just told us,— "the ancient Greeks assigned one Hades to all that died," the same the ancient Hebrews did, in regard to their Sheol. Indeed, the above quotation, stands in direct opposition to Mr. Stuart's views of both *Sheol* and *Hades*. Can he, or any other man show, that Whitby is mistaken?

I repeat the question then, what *Hebrews* does Mr. Stuart refer to in the above assertion? If he means the *later* Hebrews, the Hebrews in the days of our Lord,



his assertion is *true*; but the way they came to believe, that in *Sheol*, *Hades*, there is a *place of torment*, does no credit to the doctrine of endless Hell torments. Let us hear Dr. Campbell, one of its professed friends. In his sixth Prelim. Diss. sect. 19, he thus writes.—“But is there not one passage, it may be said, in which the word *Hades* must be understood as synonymous with *Gehenna*, and consequently must denote the place of final punishment prepared for the wicked, or *Hell* in the Christian acceptation of the term? Ye have it in the story of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 23. *In hell, en to ade, he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom.* This is the only passage in holy writ, which seems to give countenance to the opinion, that *Hades* sometimes means the same thing as *Gehenna*. Here it is represented as a place of punishment. The rich man is said to be tormented there in the midst of flames. These things will deserve to be examined narrowly. It is plain, that in the Old Testament, the most profound silence is observed in regard to the state of the deceased, their joys or sorrows, happiness or misery. It is represented to us rather by negative qualities than by positive, by its silence, its darkness, its being inaccessible, unless by preternatural means, to the living, and their ignorance about it. Thus much in general seems always to have been presumed concerning it, that it is not a state of activity adapted for exertion, or indeed for the accomplishment of any important purpose, good or bad. In most respects, however, there was a resemblance in their notions on this subject, to those of the most ancient heathens.

“But the opinions neither of Hebrews nor of heathens remained invariably the same. And from the time of the captivity, more especially from the time of the subjection of the Jews, first to the Macedonian empire, and afterwards to the Roman; as they had a

closer intercourse with Pagans, they insensibly imbibed many of their sentiments, particularly on those subjects whereon their law was silent, and wherein, by consequence, they considered themselves as at greater freedom. On this subject of a future state, we find a considerable difference in the popular opinions of the Jews in our Savior's time, from those which prevailed in the days of the ancient prophets. As both Greeks and Roman's had adopted the notion, that the ghosts of the departed were susceptible both of enjoyment and of suffering. They were led to suppose a sort of retribution in that state, for their merit or demerit in the present. The Jews did not indeed adopt the Pagan fables on this subject; nor did they express themselves entirely in the same manner; but the general train of thinking in both came pretty much to coincide. The Greek *Hades* they found well adapted to express the Hebrew *Sheol*. This they came to conceive as including different sorts of habitations for ghosts of different characters. And though they did not receive the terms *Elysium* or *Elysian fields*, as suitable appellations for the regions peopled by good spirits, they took instead of them, as better adapted to their own theology, *the garden of Eden*, or *Paradise*, a name originally Persian, by which the word answering to *garden*, especially when applied to Eden, had commonly been rendered by the seventy. To denote the same state, they sometimes used the phrase *Abraham's bosom*, a metaphor borrowed from the manner in which they reclined at meals. But, on the other hand, to express the unhappy situation of the wicked in that intermediate state, they do not seem to have declined the use of the word *Tartarus*. The Apostle, Peter, 2 Epis. ii. 4. says of evil angels that *God cast them down to Hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment*. So it stands in the common version, though neither *Gehenna* nor *Hades* are in the original,

where the expression is *seiràis zophou Tartarosas paredoken eis krisin teteremenous*. The word is not *Gehenna*; for that comes after judgment; but *Tartarus*, which is, as it were, the prison of *Hades*, wherein criminals are kept till the general judgment. And as, in the ordinary use of the Greek word, it was comprehended under *Hades*, as a part; it ought, unless we had some positive reason to the contrary, by the ordinary rules of interpretation, to be understood so here. There is then no inconsistency in maintaining that the rich man, though in torments, was not in *Gehenna*, but in that part of *Hades* called *Tartarus*, where we have seen already that spirits reserved for judgment are detained in darkness."

Such are the statements of Dr. Campbell. For a correction of his views of 2 Peter ii. 4. and some other things in this quotation, we refer to the next section. Here, we submit for the consideration of the reader the following remarks.

1st, He declares, that the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, is the only place in Holy Writ, which seems to give countenance to the opinion, that *Hades* sometimes means the same thing as *Gehenna*. We have seen already, he denies that *Hades* is the place of *eternal* punishment; and that he contends for *Gehenna* being this place, we shall see in the next chapter.

2d, He says—"it is plain that in the Old Testament, the most profound silence is observed in regard to the state of the deceased, their joys or sorrows, happiness or misery." If the Old Testament maintains a *profound silence* on this subject, it ought to be inquired,

3d, How did the Jews in our Lord's day, come to consider *Hades* as a place of punishment for the wicked? That a change in their opinions on this subject, had taken place, is evident; for he says,—“on this subject of a future state, we find a considerable difference in the popular opinions of the Jews in our Sav-

ior's time, from those which prevailed in the days of the ancient prophets." Well, how did this change in their opinions take place? Was it by some new revelation which God made to them? He thus accounts for the change of their opinions. "But the opinions neither of Hebrews nor of heathen, remained invariably the same. And from the time of the captivity, more especially from the time of the subjection of the Jews, first to the Macedonian empire, and afterwards to the Roman; as they had a closer intercourse with Pagans, they insensibly imbibed many of their sentiments particularly on those subjects whereon their law was silent, and wherein, by consequence, they considered themselves as at greater freedom.\* As both Greeks and Romans had adopted the notion, that the ghosts of the deceased were susceptible both of enjoyment and of suffering, they were led to suppose a sort of retribution in that state, for their merit or demerit in the present. The Jews did not indeed adopt the Pagan fables on this subject, nor did they express themselves entirely in the same manner; but their general train of thinking in both came pretty much to coincide."—This statement, is surely too plain to be misunderstood. How much plainer could he have told us, that a punishment in *Hades* was a mere *heathen notion*, which the Jews learned from their intercourse with them? He declares, that neither Sheol nor Hades is used in Scripture to express a place of punishment, and shows, that the Pagan fables teach it, and the Jews learned it from them. What are we then to think, when this is the account of the doctrine of hell torments by one of its professed friends? Had this statement been given by a professed Universalist, the cry would be raised that it was a mere fabrication of his own, in support of his system. But this is the state-

\* But who has the *freedom*, to adopt, or invent opinions on the subject of a future state? The indulgence of this freedom by others before us, occasions our difficulties now on the subject.

ment of Dr. Campbell, late principal of Marischal college, Aberdeen, who lived and died, a celebrated theologian in the church of Scotland. It is notorious, that the Jews derived these opinions from their intercourse with the heathen. Where the heathen got them he does not inform us. Had they been from divine revelation, the heathen ought to have learned them from the Jews. But here the matter is reversed. The heathen it seems anticipated divine revelation, as to punishment in Hades. They revealed it to the Jews by means of their fables. The Jews it is said,—“did not adopt their fables, nor did they express themselves entirely in the same manner, but their general train of thinking came pretty much to coincide.” That man must be very dull, who does not learn from this, that torment in Hades, had its origin in heathenism, and, that the Jews were ignorant of it, until they learned it from the heathen.—From all this, will it be easy for any one to resist the conviction, that to this popular opinion, which the Jews had imbibed from their intercourse with the heathen, our Lord alluded in his parable of the rich man and Lazarus? He no more attempts to correct this Pagan notion, than the common opinion, that satan had bound a woman eighteen years with an infirmity.

4th, Dr. Campbell further declares, that though the Jews did not adopt the Pagan fables on this subject, yet their train of thinking pretty much coincided. “The Greek Hades they found well adapted to express the Hebrew Sheol. This they came to conceive as including different sorts of habitations for ghosts of different characters.” They did not adopt the terms Elysian fields, to express the region of good spirits, but he says, “they do not seem to have declined the use of the word Tartarus” to express the unhappy situation of the wicked in an intermediate state. Concerning the word Tartarus, he says—“the word is not Gehenna, for that comes after judgment, but Tartarus, which is, as it



were, the prison of Hades, wherein criminals are kept till the general judgment." What then is to be done with the criminals which had been confined in this prison? They are not then to be released, and made happy. They must be sent somewhere after this period, and no place so suitable could be devised as Gehenna. But whether it be a very happy device, in establishing the doctrine of eternal misery, will appear from the next chapter. All we wish noticed here, is, that then we shall have done with *Hades*, and *Tartarus*, the prison of *Hades*, and all punishment in them, for they are to be no more. This is not only the opinion of the authors we have quoted, but we believe is the general opinion of all the learned.

2d, Mr. Stuart also asserts—"That in *Hades*, *Sheol*, according to the views of *Jesus himself* there was a place of torment, is put out of all question by the passage now before us." Well; by the same passage, it is put out of all question, that literal fire was the cause of the torment, for the rich man said—"I am tormented in this flame." The passage also puts it out of all question, that he had bodily members in Hell. He had eyes and could see; ears and could hear; a tongue and could speak in Hell. Besides, the passage puts it out of all question, that the good and bad are after death, located so near each other, that they can familiarly converse together, etc. But does Mr. Stuart also believe all this? We presume not.

2d, But if this parable puts it out of all question, that in *Hades*, *Sheol*, there is a place of torment, then other passages put it out of all question, that our Lord believed in *demons*; in an evil being called *satan*; in ghosts; and that the sacred writers believed in witchcraft. Did not Jesus often speak of *demons* as real beings? Did he not speak as if *satan* had bound a woman eighteen years with an infirmity? And are not *ghosts*, and *witchcraft*, spoken of as realities? Now, if it is said, in

these cases the writers only speak in accommodation to popular opinions, the same must be said respecting the parable in question. There is no escape here, but by boldly affirming they are all realities. But Mr. Stuart, must then abandon his skepticism about ghosts ; for is not his *Tartarus* a deep region beneath peopled with ghosts ? The evidence, is fifty times more, that *démons* are real beings, than that *Hades* is a place of torment, and yet I question if he believes in demons.

3d, If this parable puts it out of all question, that in *Hades*, *Sheol*, there is a *place of torment*, then Isai xiv. 9—20, puts it out of all question, that persons are alive in *Sheol*, and insult one another there. But Mr. Stuart takes the liberty to say about this passage, pp. 121, 122. “A deep region beneath, peopled with ghosts, is what we do not believe in. Nor is there any more certainty that it is true, because this method of speaking about it in the scriptures is adopted, than that the sun goes round the earth, because they speak of it as doing so. In most cases, it is the language of poetry which employs the popular methods of representation. It is poetry which gives a kind of life and animation to the inhabitants of the under-world. Poetry personifies that world, so in Isai. v. 14. Prov. xxvii. 20, xxx. 15, 16. and xii. 1. Above all is this the case, in that most striking passage in Isai. xiv, 9—20, in which all commentators are compelled to admit a fictitious or imaginary costume. Here the ghosts rise up from their places of repose, and meet and insult the king of Babylon, and exult over his fall. All is life and animation, when he goes down into the under-world. Yet who was ever misled by this passage, and induced to regard it as a passage to be *literally* understood. But if this be very plain, then are other passages of a nature in any respect similiar, equally plain also.” On this quotation, in connection with the parable before us, we remark.

1st, Is not Isai. xiv. 9—20 and Luke xvi. 19—32

very similar? The king of Babylon in the one, and the rich man in the other, are both represented as in *Sheol* or *Hades* after death. Both are represented as alive there. All is life and animation, when both go to *Sheol* or *Hades*. Both find company there. Both find persons ready to converse with them there. In these, and other things the passages are very similar indeed, so much so, that they may be called the same.

2d, By what rule of scripture interpretation, does Mr. Stuart then conclude, Isai. xiv. 9—20, is not to be understood literally, but that Luke xvi. 19—32, is to be interpreted literally? How does he determine, the one is the language of poetry, but the other is a reality? That the one has “a *fictitious* or *imaginary* costume” but the other is a *plain narrative of facts*? What, I ask, is there in the one passage more than the other, which leads him to such different interpretations of them. Has he not told us—“*other passages of a nature in any respect similar*” to Isai. xiv. 9—20, must be interpreted as the *language of poetry*; as having a *fictitious* and *imaginary* costume? If the one passage is the language of *poetry*, the other is the language of *parable*. And if the one passage—“employs the popular methods of representations” so does the other. And what intelligent man can deny, the representations in both had their origin in fable? If it is poetry or fable, “which gives a kind of life and animation to the inhabitants of the under-world,” it is also poetry or fable, which represents Hades as a place of torment. And if there is no “certainty that it is true, because this method of speaking about it in scripture is adopted” in the one case, neither is there any certainty in the other. There is no more certainty in either case, than that the sun goes round the earth, because the scriptures speak of it as doing so.

3d, I am aware it will be said—There is one great difference between the two passages. In Luke xvi. 19—

32, the rich man in Hades is represented as *in torment*, but no such representation is given of the king of Babylon in Sheol, Isai. xiv. 9—20. This is freely granted; but a few remarks will account for this difference, and place the subject in a proper light. We ask then, why it was not said concerning the king of Babylon, that he was *in torment* in Sheol, just as well as the rich man in Hades? Was the king of Babylon, so much better than the rich man, that he did not deserve it? As no man will affirm, any Old Testament writer said, concerning the wickedest man that ever went to Sheol—“*and in Sheol he lifted up his eyes being in torment*,” how are we to account for this difference? If what Mr. Stuart asserts be true,—“that in Hades, Sheol, according to the views of the Hebrews, and of Jesus himself, there was a place of torment,” this ought to have been said, and said frequently, both in the Old and New Testaments. It was incumbent on him, to account for the silence of the Old Testament writers, as to *Sheol* being a place of torment, if his assertion be true. But, it is without foundation, and opposed above by Dr. Campbell, and other critics. Dr. Whitby we have seen, declares, Sheol, Hades, was not a receptacle of souls, but that this was a mere notion of the heathen Greeks. But I shall account for the difference between the two passages.

1st, In the days of Isaiah, the Jews did not believe *Sheol* or *Hades* was a place of torment. This doctrine was not taught in the sacred books of the Jews; nor had it then been imported from the heathen. This is testified by Dr. Campbell, Whitby, Macknight, and others. Poetry then, had given a kind of life and animation to the dead in Sheol, as Mr. Stuart shows, but the poets had not gone so far, as to represent them as either in torment or happiness. It was impossible then in the nature of things for Isaiah chap. xiv. 9—20, to represent the king of Babylon as tormented in Sheol, for then no such popular opinion among the Jews prevailed.

2d, But when our Lord spoke the parable, Luke xvi. 19—32, the opinion prevailed among the Jews, that there was torment in Hades. How they came to imbibed this opinion, we have seen from Dr. Campbell above, and Mr. Stuart and his son, has traced the doctrine of punishment in Hades to heathen origin. That our Lord in this passage, speaks in accordance with the heathen popular opinions, which prevailed in Judea at the time, is rather reluctantly admitted by Dr. Macknight. Perhaps he foresaw the danger of admitting it. He says “v. 23, *seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom.*” Because the opinions as well as the language of the Greeks had by this time made their way into Judea, some imagine that our Lord had their fictions about the abodes of departed souls in his eye, when he formed this parable. But the argument is not conclusive (where lies its defect?) At the same time it must be acknowledged, that his descriptions of these things are not drawn from the writings of the Old Testament, but have a remarkable affinity to the descriptions which the Grecian poets have given of them. They, as well as our Lord, represent the abodes of the blessed as lying contiguous to the region of the damned, and separated only by a great impassable river or gulf, in such a sort that the ghosts could talk with one another from its opposite banks. In the parable, souls whose bodies were buried, knew each other, and conversed together as if they had been embodied. In like manner, the Pagans introduce departed souls talking together, and represent them as having pains and pleasures analogous to what we feel in this life; it seems they thought the shades of the dead had an exact resemblance to their bodies. The parable says, the souls of wicked men are tormented in flames; the Grecian mythologists tell us they lie in *Pryphligethon*, which is a river of fire, where they suffer the same torments they would have suffered while alive, had their bodies been burnt.”



Macknight here confesses, 1st, that “the opinions as well as the language of the Greeks, had by this time made their way into Judea.” He also confesses, that our Lord’s descriptions about the abodes of departed souls are not drawn from the writings of the Old Testament, but have a remarkable affinity to the descriptions which the Grecian poets have given of them.” This confirms, what Dr. Campbell and others stated above.

2d, As it is admitted, our Lord’s descriptions here about the abodes of departed souls, are not drawn from the writings of the Old Testament, and as such descriptions have a remarkable affinity to that of the Grecian poets, I ask, were those descriptions true? If it is answered yes, I then ask, why were not the sacred writers in the Old Testament, as able to give such descriptions as the Grecian poets? If such descriptions, are here sanctioned as truth by our Lord, it is evident the heathen had the honor of inventing hell torments, and from them Jews and christians have learned this doctrine. But such a view of this parable, stands opposed to the whole usage of *Sheol* and *Hades* in the Old and New Testaments. This is the solitary text, in a parable too, where *Sheol* or *Hades* can be supposed to teach future punishment. He who asserts, our Lord sanctioned this doctrine here, virtually says he understands the parable better than Christ’s apostles, for not one of them so understood it. Who can think, they believed.—“that in *Hades*, *Sheol*, according to the views of *Jesus himself* there was a place of torment,” yet never taught this doctrine to the world?

Should any one object—if our Lord in this parable, only spoke in accommodation to the prevailing popular opinions, was he not liable to be misunderstood? I answer no; not any more, than when he spoke of demons, satan, ghosts, etc. The scriptures, which the Jews had in their hands, were opposed to such a popular opinion, for they taught nothing about *immortal souls*,

*departed souls, separate spirits*, or their being tormented in Sheol or Hades. Nothing is said here about the *soul* of the rich man. I may add, if our Lord on this occasion, by speaking in accomodation to the popular opinions, meant to sanction them as truth, he acted contrary to his usual practice on other occasions. I know of no instance, where he ever spoke of a popular opinion, which had no sanction from the old Testament, with a view to sanction it as truth. Our Lord's work was to teach the truth, not to correct the popular modes of speaking.

3d, There are other heathen popular opinions alluded to in the New Testament, which the Jews in the Old seem to have known nothing about. For example, what is more common in the New Testament, than to read of *demons* or *Devils*; of persons possessed with them; and of their being cast out of them. But nothing of this kind, is found in the Old Testament. I might ask, how is this difference to be accounted for? The answer, is precisely the same as in the case before us. In the days of Moses and the prophets, the popular opinions about demons, were unknown among the Jews. But in the days of our Lord they were common, and are often alluded to in the New Testament. But like torment in Hades, such opinions had been imbibed by the Jews from their intercourse with the heathen, after the Babylonian captivity.

*Sheol*, in Isai. xiv. 9—20, and most other texts where it occurs, Mr. Stuart says, it means the *grave*, *under-world*, or *the region of the dead*. Why not interpret *Hades*, Luke xvi. 23 in the same way, for it is allowed on all hands, that *Sheol* and *Hades* are only the Hebrew and Greek names for the same place. Wakefield does interpret *Hades* so, for he says—"v. 23 *in the grave*; *en to ade*; and conformably to this representation, he (the rich man) is spoken of as having a body v. 24. It must be remembered, that Hades

no where means hell, *gehenna* in any author whatsoever, sacred or profane: and also, that our Lord is giving his hearers a parable (Math. xiii. 34) and not a piece of real history. To them, who regard the narrative as exhibiting a reality, it must stand as an unanswerable argument for the *purgatory* of the papists. The universal meaning of Hades is—the state of death: because the term *sepulchrum*, or *grave*, is not strictly applicable to such as have been consumed by fire, etc. see v. 30.”

Understanding *Hades* then, in this parable to mean, what *Sheol* does, Isai. xiv. 9—20, all is plain, and natural, and in agreement with the Old Testament. The only material difference, between the two passages is, the rich man is said to be in torment in *Hades*, and this difference we think has been rationally accounted for above. *Hades*, *Sheol*, *grave*, *under-world*, *region of the dead*, is here represented, in conformity to the prevailing opinions in our Lord's day, as a place of torment and this was only a small addition, to the popular opinions in the days of Isaiah. Since persons, had been represented as alive and full of animation in *Sheol*, or *Hades*, it was natural for the fancy of the poet, to describe them as happy or miserable.

Dr. Hammond on this passage says—“that this is not a story but a parable, may appear by Gamara Babyj. Ad. Cod. Berachoth, where thus much of it is set down, that a *King made a great feast, and invited all the strangers, and there came one poor man and stood at his gates, and said unto them, give me one bit or portion, and they considered him not, and he said, my Lord the king, of all the great feast thou hast made, is it hard in thine eyes to give me one bit or fragment among them.*” He adds, the title of this parable is, “*a parable of a king of flesh and blood.*” See also, my Letters to Mr. Hudson, for what Dr. Whitby has said respecting this parable. The views of Christians in for-

mer ages, as stated by him, were very different respecting this parable from those which are now entertained.

3d, The only other question to be considered is—what did our Lord mean to teach when he uttered this parable? That our Lord, was not speaking on the subject of a future state when he introduced it, is obvious from the context. See verses 14—18. And no one ought to say, our Lord taught in *parables*, a doctrine no where taught in plain language in the bible. But this must be said, if in this parable he did teach, that in *Hades* there is a place of punishment. No Old or New Testament writer says *Sheol* or *Hades* is a place of torment; a repository for good or bad souls after death. Nor did our Lord's disciples so understand this parable. What our Lord uttered in parables, they were to proclaim on the house tops, or express in plain language. But none of them say, Hades is a place of torment, a doctrine they certainly would have taught, had they believed it announced by our Lord in this parable.

What then did our Lord mean to teach, by so representing Hades as a place of torment? This question may be answered, by asking one or two more. What did our Lord mean to teach, when he spoke of demons as real beings? And what did he mean to teach, when he spoke of Satan as a real being Luke xiii. 10—18? Did he mean to recognize these beings as real? We should think not; but only availed himself of the prevailing popular opinions, in reasoning with his opponents, to enforce his instructions and convince them. Is it not so here? Our Lord was reasoning with the Pharisees, who believed the popular opinion, that in Hades there was a place of torment. They also professed faith in Moses's writings. But he here says, if they did not believe him to be the Messiah, from what Moses and the prophets had said concerning him, they would not be persuaded of this, if one coming from

*Hades*, their supposed repository of souls testified it to them. This view of the parable, is in conformity with our Lord's conduct and teaching on other occasions. But to suppose, he here teaches, that *Hades* is a place of torment after death, is at variance with the whole usage of *Sheol* and *Hades* in the bible. And why should we suppose he sanctions such a doctrine, which had its origin in heathenism. For further evidence of this and other remarks on this parable, see my Letters to Mr. Hudson, and Reply to Mr. Stuart's essays, etc.

Acts, ii. 27. "Because thou wilt not leave my soul (me) in hell (*Hades*) neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." *Grave* is evidently the sense of *Hades* here; and refers to Christ who was raised from the dead. See Psal. xvi. 10. under *Sheol*.

Acts ii. 31. "He seeing this before, spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul (he) was not left in hell, (*Hades*), neither his flesh did see corruption." *Grave* as in the last text, the same as *Sheol*, Psal. xvi. 10.

1 Cor. xv. 55. "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, (*Hades*) where is thy victory?" *Hades* here plainly means *grave*, and was so understood by our translators. The grave shall not always retain its dead—hence the question—"O grave where is thy victory?" The dead shall be raised incorruptible.

Rev. i. 18. "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for ever more, amen; and have the keys of hell, (*Hades*), and of death." This is explained by Acts ii. 27, 31, above. To have the keys of *Hades* or the grave, shows that Jesus has power to raise from the dead, which he will do in the last day.

Rev. vi. 8. "And I looked, and behold a pale horse; and his name that sat on him was death, and hell (*Hades*) followed with him." *Hades* here evidently means *grave*. It follows death, as is here represented. Mr. Stuart on this text observes—"here is



the king of the empire of the dead, with his subjects in his train. Hades, in this passage, stands for the inhabitants of Hades; just as in innumerable cases, we employ the name of a country in order to designate the inhabitants of the same." But I ask, is the king of the empire of the dead a living being? Are his subjects living beings? No, the inhabitants of Hades the grave, are all the dead; and death the king of terrors, of the grave, shall reign over them until raised from the dead. See 1 Cor. xv. 55. above.

Rev. xx. 13. "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell, (Hades), delivered up the dead which were in them." Here death, "the king over the region of the dead," is again introduced. What then does this passage say he "*delivered up*?" Was it—*immortal souls*, which *Hades* delivered up? No. Were they living beings of any kind? No; not any more than the sea delivered up immortal souls or living beings. No; the sea delivered up the *dead* which were in it. And "*death* and *Hades* delivered up the *dead* which were in them." But according to the common views of Hades in Luke xvi. 23, Hades ought to have delivered up the *immortal souls* which had long been in torment there. Had John believed, as most people do now about Hades or hell, no doubt but he would have told us this. But wherever the resurrection of the dead is mentioned in scripture, not a word is said about immortal souls, coming forth from Hades, hell, or any other place. But why not, if immortal souls are punished there from death until the resurrection?

Rev. xx. 14. "And death and *hell*, (Hades), were cast into the lake of fire; this is the second death." On this passage, Dr. Campbell pertinently remarks—"If we interpret *Hades*, *hell*, in the Christian sense of the word, the whole passage is rendered nonsense. *Hell*, is represented as being cast into *hell*: for so the lake

of fire, which is in this place also denominated the second death, is universally interpreted."

Concerning the usage of *Hades* in the apocalypse, Mr. Stuart says—"it is the genuine *Sheol* of the Hebrews; with the exception, perhaps, that the Hebrew sacred books have no where represented Hades as having a king over it." I then ask, does John in this book say, that in Hades there is a Tartarus? No. Why then did Mr. Stuart say above, "that in the Hebrew *Sheol* there was a Tartarus?" Does he know more about this than John did? The reason, why the Hebrew sacred books, have no where represented *Sheol* or *Hades* as having a king over it, is obvious. This popular opinion, like many others derived from the heathen, was unknown to the ancient Hebrews. They knew of no king, God, or devil, who ruled in *Sheol*, or that it was a place of torment for the wicked.

Such are all the passages where Hades occurs in the New Testament. Let the reader now judge, what foundation they afford, for the doctrine, that Hades is a place of future punishment. In addition to the remarks, made on the general usage of *Sheol* above, we add here the following respecting Hades.

1st, It will not be disputed by any man, that what the Hebrew writers of the Old Testament expressed by the word *Sheol*, the Greeks expressed by the word Hades.

2d, But observe, that the heathen Greeks not only attached similar ideas to the word Hades, as the Hebrew writers did to the word *Sheol*, but also the additional idea, that in Hades persons were punished or rewarded, according to their merits or demerits in the present world. This punishment was by fire. This was their own addition; for no such idea seems to be conveyed in all the Old Testament, by the word *Sheol*. The very circumstance, that *Hades*, and not *Sheol*, is represented as a place of torment, shows, that this doc-

trine is of heathen origin. Hades is a Greek word ; and it is well known that Greek was the language of the heathen, and Hebrew that of the Jews. There is nothing then, but what we ought to expect, in the use of the term Hades in the New Testament. Besides, the Jews had blended many of the heathen notions with their own religion. If we then find the New Testament writers, in using the Greek word Hades, speak as if this was a place of punishment, it is easily accounted for without admitting that they believed any such thing, or wished to inculcate this doctrine as a part of divine revelation. But of this they have been very sparing ; for only in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, can it be supposed there is any allusion to such an idea. All the other places where they use the term Hades, it is plain no such doctrine seems to be hinted at, but the reverse. In face of these facts and circumstances, and current usage of the word Hades, we think it would be well for persons to pause and reflect, before they attempt to establish the doctrine of future misery from the language of a parable. If a Universalist was obliged to establish his views from a parable, and in face of so much evidence to the contrary, he would be considered as driven to the last extremity for proof in support of his system, and that finally it must be abandoned as indefensible. But this parable is considered as the most plain and conclusive part of Scripture, in proof of a place of endless misery. It is considered more conclusive than all the passages which speak of Gehenna. What critics and orthodox commentators, give up as no proof of the doctrine, by the least informed, is considered as the very strongest.

3d, Since neither *Sheol*, *Hades*, nor *hell*, originally signified a place of endless misery, we have a few questions to put to those who believe in this doctrine. We ask, then, is it not a perversion of the divine oracles, to quote any of the texts in which *Sheol* or *Hades* occurs, to

prove it? It is well known, that such texts are often quoted for this purpose. But I ask again, is it not a very great imposition upon the ignorant, to quote such texts in proof of this doctrine? The simple, honest-hearted English reader of his bible, has been taught from a child, that *hell* means a place of endless misery for the wicked. Every book he reads, every sermon he hears, all tend to deepen his early impressions, and confirm him in this opinion. Those who know better, are not much disposed to undeceive him. On the one hand, they are perhaps deterred from it by a false fear of disturbing public opinion, and on the other, by reluctance to encounter the odium of the Christian public, in being looked on as heretics. Select the most celebrated preacher you can find, and let him frankly tell his audience, that Sheol, Hades, nor hell, originally meant a place of endless misery, and his celebrity is at an end. He would from that moment be considered as an heretic, and his former admirers would now be his warm opposers. But I ask again, and I solemnly put it to every man's conscience, who professes to fear God,—Ought not men to be honestly told the truth about this, let the consequences be what they may? Are we at liberty to pervert the scriptures in favor of any sect, or system in the world? Must we be guilty of a pious fraud, in concealing from people what they ought to know, because the disclosure may excite popular prejudices against ourselves, and afford cause of suspicion that the doctrine of endless misery is not true? If it be *true*, it *can*, and *must* be supported from other texts than those in which Sheol and Hades are used. Perhaps some may think, if all those texts are given up, some of the principal supports of the doctrine are removed. Well, allowing this true, would any one wish to retain them, but such as are determined to hold fast the doctrine of eternal misery at all hazards? It is a false system of religion, or those who embrace it do not know how to de-

fend it, who wish to support it by perverting a single text of scripture. To found the doctrine of endless misery on the texts which speak of Sheol or Hades, is building on the sand. When the building is assailed by reason and argument, and an appeal to the Bible, it must fall, if it has no better support. Even, if it could be proved true from other texts, this is calculated to bring the doctrine into suspicion.

4th, The translators of our common English version, appear to have had more correct ideas about Sheol, Hades or hell, than most people who read their translation. They certainly were at some pains, to guard us against attaching to the word hell, the idea of a place of misery. In many places where they render Sheol and Hades by the word hell, they have put grave in the margin. Besides ; let it be remembered, that the word hell originally signified the same as Sheol and Hades. It was then the very best word they could use in rendering these two words. If men now have fixed a different sense to the word hell, the translators are not to blame. Admitting, that when our translation was made, it had acquired the sense of a place of endless misery, what could the translators do but use this word in rendering Sheol and Hades ? It meant the same as those words originally ; and to prevent misunderstanding, they frequently put grave in the margin. They no doubt thought, that this, together with the context, was security against all misapprehension. Unfortunately this has not been the case. But no blame attaches to them, for they must in this case have either coined a new word, expressed themselves by a circumlocution, used always the word grave, or left these words untranslated. I am inclined to think, that if Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, had been left untranslated, few persons would ever have thought, that by any of these words a place of misery after death was meant. Every reader would then have been obliged to consult the context, wherev-



er these words were used, to attain the sense of the writer. Obligated to do this, he would soon have become familiar with them, and must have seen, from the way in which they were used, that the idea of a place of future misery was never intended to be conveyed by them. Let any one go over all the texts where these words are found, and put this remark to a fair trial. It is true, that our translators, in rendering the word Gehenna, have also used the word hell. But here again, what could they do, for this word had acquired a new sense. This new sense they supposed answered to the word Gehenna, the place of endless misery. Here they were under the necessity of either again coining a new word, leaving Gehenna untranslated, or expressing themselves by a circumlocution. We doubt if the translators were at liberty to do any of these, without shocking public prejudice, and exciting the displeasure of those in high authority, under whose patronage they made their translation. They were not left at liberty to give us the best translation, which their own judgments, and the progress of Biblical criticism, even at that day, could have afforded. In proof of this, see the king's instructions to the translators.

5th, Several very serious evils arise from understanding Sheol or Hades to mean a place of endless misery. In the first place, it is a perversion of those texts in which these words occur. This perversion of them leads to a misunderstanding of many others. By this means the knowledge such texts convey, is not only lost, but our knowledge of the word of God is greatly retarded, and our minds are perplexed and embarrassed on other connected subjects. Every text of Scripture misunderstood, lays a foundation for a misunderstanding of others; and thus error is not only rendered perpetual but progressive. But this is not all. Understanding Sheol and Hades to mean a place of endless misery, is perverting God's word to caricature himself. It is putting

our own sense on his words, to make him say things against ourselves which he never intended. It is giving a false color to the language of the bible, that we may support the false views we entertain of his character, and his dealings with the children of men.

6th, I may just add about Hades, what was noticed about Sheol, that we never find the words eternal, everlasting, or forever, used in connexion with it, or concerning it. We never read of an everlasting or eternal *Hades* or *hell*, or that men are to be punished in it forever. Nothing like this is to be found in scripture. Such epithets added to the word *hell*, found in books and sermons, are among the improvements in divinity which man's wisdom teacheth. The word *hell* is first perverted from its original signification, and then the word *eternal* is added to it, to make the punishment of endless duration.

---

### SECTION III.

#### 2 PETER, ii. 4, CONSIDERED.

“For if God spared not the Angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, (*Tartaros*), and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment.” See Jude 6, to which I shall also advert in my remarks.

Although the word *Tartarus*, does not occur in the Bible, yet the word *Tartaros* occurs in this single text. It is equivalent to *Tartarus*; it signifies—“to cast into *Tartarus*.” See Parkhurst. Professor Stuart asserts—“that a place of punishment is here indicated by *Tartarus*, is put beyond all doubt by the context—he spared not,’ ‘*chains* of darkness,’ ‘imprisoned for judgment or condemnation.” But what is there in

these expressions, which says, the angels, or any other beings, suffered *pain* or *misery* in Tartarus? They are not even said to be *alive* there, far less suffering torment. In my reply to his Essays, I have considered pretty fully, what he says about Tartarus. See also a quotation from Dr. Campbell in the preceding section, which relates to this subject. In what follows, I shall principally confine the readers attention, to what I consider the true sense of the passage, or passages in question.

1st, Let us examine what period is referred to, called in the one passage simply "*judgment*," and in the other, "*the judgment of the great day*." These expressions, are supposed to refer to a "*day of general judgment*," at the end of this material world. But I know of no sacred writer, who uses such language, to describe such a day. I find however this, or very similar language used, to describe God's judgments on the Jewish nation at the close of the Mosaic dispensation. "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood before *the great and terrible day of the Lord come*." Joel, ii. 31. Peter, Acts ii. 20. quotes these words, and applies them to this very event. Again, Malachi iv, 5. says, "behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet, before *the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord*," in reference to the same event. Our Lord, alluding to this period said, Luke xxi. 22—"For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled." And adds, Math. xxiv. 21, "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." But are the tribulations of this supposed day of judgment, to be less than the tribulations which came on the Jewish nation at the destruction of Jerusalem? If not, how can our Lord's words be true? In Rev. vi. 17. we read also of "*the great day*," and "*the great day of God Almighty*;" but no man will say, that this refers to a day of

general judgment at the end of this world. The context shows, this cannot be meant.

2d, Let us now consider who are referred to by the *angels*, that kept not their first estate, (principality), but left their own habitation? The reader ought to notice particularly, that neither of the texts, give the least intimation, that they were *angelic Spirits*, sinned in heaven, and were cast out of it. It is said they sinned, but not in heaven. They kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, but it is not said, this habitation was heaven. Indeed, if we admit, *angelic Spirits*, once sinned in heaven and were cast out of it, what security is there, that this may not take place again; yea, that all who are there may not become sinners, and share the same fate? The question then is—what angels are here referred to? I answer, it is well known the term rendered *angel*, is not a name of *nature* but of *office*. It is frequently rendered *messenger* and is often applied to human beings. Some have thought, the angels here mentioned, were the spies sent out to view the land of Canaan. I am of opinion however, that Korah and his company, are the angels here referred to; the history of whom is given, Num. 16th. My reasons for entertaining this opinion, I shall briefly detail, and let the reader judge for himself.

1st, Korah and his company were two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown." Num. 16. 2. From the high station, which they held in the congregation, with scriptural propriety they might be termed *Angels*. Certainly, with just as much propriety, as men are called *Angels* in many other passages. See for example Rev. Chaps. 2d. and 3d.

2d, It will not be questioned, Korah and his company sinned: and their sin was, they kept not their first estate, or the station God assigned them in the congregation of Israel. They raised a rebellion against Moses

and Aaron, Num. 16: 3, with a view to their own pre-eminence. They sought the priesthood also v. 10. Certainly, the passage applies much better to them than *Angelic Spirits*, who sinned in heaven, and were cast out of it. People, are more indebted to Milton's paradise lost, than to their bible for the information, that angelic Spirits sinned in heaven and were cast down to Tartarus.

3d, The connexion in which the passage is introduced, favors this view of the subject. Peter, in verses 1—4, speaks of false teachers, and the troubles which their heresies gave to the congregation of Christians. At the close of verse 3, he says of them, whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not." Was it not then very natural for him, in verse 4, to refer to Korah and his company, who produced similar troubles in the congregation of Israel and the judgment which came on them? He then from verse 5—9, mentions God's judgments on the Old world and the cities of the plain, confessedly inflicted on human beings, and of a temporal nature. It is very incongruous then to suppose, that in verse 4, he referred to Angelic beings, and punishment of endless duration in another world. But the connexion of the parallel text in Jude, is still more clearly in favor of the view I have given. Jude, verse 4, also speaks of false teachers, and the pernicious effects of their teaching on others. He adds, by way of warning verse 5, "I will therefore put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this, how that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them that believed not." And what could be more natural, than for him in verse 6, to refer to Korah and his company, as a signal example of God's destroying such unbelievers? It is certainly more rational, than to suppose, he immediately breaks off, and introduces an example of God's judgment on Angels who sinned in heav-



en. He also refers in verse 9, to God's judgments on the cities of the plain. But if verse 6, refers to Angelic Spirits, we must conclude, that he first gives an example in general of God's judgments on men v. 5, then in v. 6, starts off and gives an example of his judgment on angelic Spirits in heaven, and then comes back to his judgments on men in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. But if my views are admitted, it makes both writers, refer to temporal judgments on men, uniformly throughout both passages. Certainly all will allow, it is not the custom of the sacred writers, to blend in this way, examples of God's judgments on men and angels together. If it is done here, another example of the kind, cannot be produced from the bible.

4th, It will be admitted, that all the other examples mentioned in the contexts of these passages, of God's judgments on men, were adduced as a warning to ungodly men. They are all of a temporal nature, and are calculated for this purpose. But, if we understand by *Angels* in these passages *angelic Spirits*, how could God's casting them out of heaven down to Tartarus, be any warning to ungodly men? No man had seen this done, or had any means of knowing the fact, if it was true. It rested entirely on Peter and Jude's statements in these passages, for no other sacred writer ever mentions such a remarkable event, as angels' sinning in heaven and being cast down to Tartarus. But the case of Korah and his company, is detailed at length in the Jewish Scriptures, was well known, and calculated to be a warning to those who lived ungodly. But it will be asked, what Tartarus did God cast them down to?—Further evidence of my views will be then given by considering this. viz.

3d, The punishment here said to have been inflicted on them. Peter says, God "spared not the Angels that sinned but cast them down to *hell*, (*Tartaros*), and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved

unto judgment." Jude says, "He hath reserved them in everlasting chains of darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." Let us here inquire, 1st, What Peter meant by *Tartarus*? Mr. Stuart says, as "to the *usus loquendi* of the classics, in Greek, the word *Tartarus* is employed to designate a supposed subterranean region, as deep down below the upper part of *Hades*, as the earth is distant from heaven. It is the place where the distinguished objects of Jupiter's vengeance are represented as being confined and tormented. It is placed in opposition to, or in distinction from Elysium. I remark moreover, that the heathen had no apprehension of deliverance from Tartarus. Tantalus, Sisyphus, Ixion, and all others sent there, were doomed to *endless* punishment, in view of the Greeks and Romans." Such are the views given us of Tartarus by Mr. Stuart; and it is commonly supposed, that in this sense Peter used the word Tartarus in the passage before us. But, in the preceeding section it has been fully shown, that *Tartarus* and the punishment there, were heathen fictions, and were originally of Egyptian origin. The Egyptians furnished the first hints, and the Greeks and Romans manufactured a tremendous hell out of them.

But Mr. Stuart is obliged to confess, that the above is not the exclusive sense, in which classical writers use the term *Tartarus*. He says—"it is occasionally employed, in the later classic writers, for the *under-world* in general; but in such a connexion as to show, that it is only when writers mean to speak of the whole as a region of gloom, that they call it *Tartarus*." This concession of Mr. Stuart, is enough for our purpose, together with his explanations of *Sheol* and *Hades*. He concedes, that "the later classic writers," use *Tartarus* for the *under-world* in general, "which is his general sense of *Sheol* and *Hades*, as seen above. And he also concedes, that they use it in this sense, when they "mean to speak of the whole as a region of

gloom.” With these concessions in view, I observe 1st, Peter was a *later* scripture writer. This answers to “the later classic writers,” of whom Mr. Stuart speaks. And if they used the word Tartarus, “for the under-world in general,” and not for a place of punishment, why not allow Peter to use it in the same sense in this passage? But the reader may notice, he speaks of it, not as a place of fire and torment, which the heathen did concerning their *Tartarus*, but as the Hebrews spoke of *Sheol*.

2d, But we are told, when the “later classic writers,” used *Tartarus* for the under-world, it was “in such a connection as to show, that it is only when writers mean to speak of the whole as a region of gloom that they call it Tartarus.” Well, all I ask, is, to allow Peter the same privilege taken by these classic writers. This cannot with any show of reason be denied him. The question then is, does Peter show from the *connection*, that he means to speak of Tartarus as a place of punishment, yea of *endless punishment*; or does he speak of it as the *under-world, a region of gloom*? In the latter sense, as I shall now attempt to show. Let it then be observed—1st, Whoever may be meant by the *Angels* in the passage above, they are not said to be suffering any pain now in Tartarus. Nor is it even said, that they are reserved there to suffer pain or torment at the day of judgment mentioned. If it is maintained, the Angels mentioned are *Angelic spirits*, the passage has no reference to human beings at all.

3d, If Peter used the term *Tartarus*, in the sense of a place of misery, or “endless punishment in view of the Greeks and Romans,” he did what no other scripture writer did before him. Not one of them ever uses this term, which shows they cared nothing about *Tartarus*. But, had they believed this doctrine of endless punishment, and that *Tartarus* was the most “*significant*” word the Greek language afforded to express it,

why do they all avoid this word? Mr. Stuart asks—"What term then, in order to express the horrors of future punishment, could Peter select from the whole Greek language, which was more significant than *Tartaros*?" This question implicates, not only the sacred writers, but even the holy spirit, as not knowing what word was most "*significant*" to express the horrors of future punishment."

3d, But if Peter used the term *Tartarus*, "for the *under-world* in general," as "it is occasionally employed in the later classic writers," he agrees with all the scripture writers in their usage of *Sheol* and *Hades*, and even with those classic writers also. What is more common, than to put a part for the whole, or the whole for a part in the language of scripture? *Tartarus* was supposed to be a part of *Hades*, and here a part is used for the whole. In Luke xvi. 23, the whole, *Hades*, is put for a part, *Tartarus*; for according to the representation given, the rich man was in *Tartarus*, yet he is said to be in *Hades*.

4th, But we are told, this word was used for the *under-world*, "in such a connection as to show, that it is only when writers mean to speak of the whole as a region of gloom, that they call it *Tartarus*." If Peter then used it in "such a connection," as to show, he meant "to speak of the whole as a region of gloom," the question is settled. Does he then say, either in the text or context, that *Tartarus* was a place of torment? No. Does he intimate the angels were alive in *Tartarus*? No. Does he then speak of it as a region of gloom? Certainly he did. Hear him; "for if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell (*Tartaros*)." Well did he deliver them there into flames and torments? No. He "delivered them into *chains of darkness*." Is not this "*a region of gloom*? Let us hear Jude—"The angels which kept not their first estate but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in

*everlasting chains of darkness.*” Is not this again, *a region of gloom*? This is too palpable I think to be denied.

Let us now see, how this agrees to Korah and his company, as the *angels* who sinned and were cast down to Tartarus? In Num. xvi. 31—33, it is said, “The ground clave asunder that was under them; and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up, and their houses, and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods. They and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit, and the earth closed upon them; and they perished from among the congregation.” See on this text under *Sheol* above. They went down alive into the pit, (*Sheol*). Well, is not *Sheol* often represented as a region of gloom? Yea, does not the very word *Sheol*, as Dr. Campbell has told us, mean, “obscure, hidden, invisible. The state is always represented under those figures which suggest something dreadful, dark and silent.”

To the views of this passage, which have now been stated, it may be objected—Does not Jude say, the angels that sinned, are “reserved in *everlasting* chains of darkness, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day. I answer yes, but it has been shown, that *the judgment of the great day*, does not refer to a general judgment at the end of this world, but to the judgment of God on the Jews at the close of their dispensation. Now, though Korah and his company were punished on the spot for their rebellion, yet we are told, all the sins of the Jews as a nation, which had been committed during past ages, were at that time visited on the nation. On that generation came all the righteous blood which had been shed on the earth. Of course the rebellion of Korah and his company is included. They were delivered into chains of darkness; to be reserved unto this judgment; when God’s signal vengeance was poured out on the whole nation for all



their rebellion and wickedness. *Chains of darkness*, is a figure for the *power of darkness*; for who can burst the bands of death, who can return from Sheol to the land of the living? The word *everlasting* connected with chains of darkness in Jude, can occasion no difficulty. Those who have attended to the scripture usage of this word must see, it is often used for a limited time, and sometimes even for a short period of time. From the time of Korah's rebellion to the destruction of Jerusalem, was a much longer *everlasting*, than some *everlastings*, mentioned in scripture.

Though enough has been said, showing that punishment in Hades is a heathen notion, it may be of some use to see what were the views entertained by the ancient heathen about Hades and Tartarus. M. Le Clerc, in his *Religion of the Ancient Greeks*, p. 147—154.—thus writes:—"In general, the doctrine of a future life has been adopted by all nations, at least by all those that deserve to be cited as examples. Legislators considered it as the most effectual curb for restraining the passions of men, and they have employed every argument to establish this salutary doctrine, as we may be convinced by attending to the descriptions which the ancients have left us of Hell.

"This word signified among them the *residence of souls*. Thither, after death, they repaired in crowds to receive remuneration for their deeds. Minos sat as judge, and as the names were drawn out of the fatal urn, he distributed to each his merited punishment or reward. Pluto, seated on a throne of ebony, presided over the infernal regions; because, as we have already observed, in the symbolical religion of the ancients, part of which was dedicated to the worship of the stars, winter was the night of Nature, and because the sun at that time took the name of King of the Shades. For this reason Pluto, who represented the sun, makes so important a figure in mysteries destined to describe the

empire of the dead. That gloomy region was situated at an immense distance, far beyond the limits of this universe. According to the author of the *Theogony*, 'as far as the heaven is distant from the earth, so far is the earth removed from the dark abyss. A mass of iron, falling from the top of the starry heavens, would take nine days and nine nights before it reached the surface of the earth; and it would require the same time in falling from thence to Tartarus,' the place destined for the punishment of the wicked.

"This frightful abode was said to be twice as deep as it is distant from the brilliant summit of Olympus. It was surrounded by a triple wall, it was bathed by the flaming waters of Cocytus and of Phlegethon, and towers of iron guarded the entrance. The cruel Tysiphone watched night and day at the gate, armed with serpents, which she shook over the heads of the guilty. Their groans, their doleful cries, mixed with the sound of their stripes, cause the wide abyss to resound. There are forever shut up the impious Titans, and those no less audacious mortals who dared to resist the divinity; Tityus, Ixion, Pirithous, and the impious Salmoneus. Perjury, adultery, incest, and parricide, are likewise punished; and those whose life has been sullied with odious crimes; those who have not respected the ties of blood, who have waged unjust wars, who have sold their country; those who have dared to commit enormous wickedness, and enjoyed the fruit of their crimes, are all consigned to the most cruel torments.

"We may conceive what impression these images would make on the mind, when unceasingly presented to the eyes from earliest infancy. It is not to be doubted, that if the hope of felicity unbounded leads to virtue, the idea of endless punishment must have a still stronger influence on the conduct. The religion of the ancients, which to us appears of so light a nature that we are apt to believe its only end was to flatter the sens-

es, yet employed the most proper means for restraining the outrageous multitude.\* It alarmed them on all sides with the most frightful representations. A poet of antiquity paints, in the strongest colors, that continual terror which takes possession of the human heart, which disturbs and poisons the pleasures of life, and which in every part of the earth has erected temples for the purpose of conciliating the gods. Plato, in the beginning of the first book of his Republic, represents an old man seized with fear at the approach of death, and full of inquietude with regard to objects that never occupy the season of health. Then it is, says he, that we reflect on our crimes, on the injustice we have committed, and that often, in our agitation, we start in our sleep, and are frightened like children.† As soon as some were found among the ancients who had overcome these fears, it was pretended that such had never existed among them: we might as reasonably judge of the public belief at this day, by the opinions in which some modern writers have been pleased to indulge themselves. The testimony of those of antiquity who opposed the prejudices of their times, their very attempt to dissipate those fears, and to turn them into ridicule, rather proves how deeply they were rooted. Observe, with what solicitude, Lucretius every where endeavors to burst the bonds of religion, and to fortify his readers against the threatenings of eternal punishment. The observation of Juvenal, so often cited, that nobody in his day believed in the fables of hell, is that of an enlightened mind, which takes no part in the opinions of the vulgar. The same thing is

\* The doctrine of endless punishment among the heathen, did not make them moral men, as facts show. Nor has it done this among christians, as all must admit. The Apostles preached the love of God in the gift of his Son. This produced holiness, and it will do so again.

† Preaching endless hell torments in the present day, produces not only *fear*, but many cases of *insanity* and *suicide*. Can God be the author of such a doctrine?

to be said of what we read in Cicero, and in some other writers, on the same subject : and when Virgil exclaims, ‘happy the man that can tread under foot inexorable Destiny, and the noise of devouring Acheron,’ he indicates, in a manner sufficiently precise, that it was the province of philosophy alone to shake off the yoke of custom, riveted by education.

“Those who were unable to conquer these vain terrors, found consolations of a different kind. Religion stretched forth her kind hand to encourage their hopes, and to relieve their despondency. When remorse had brought back, within her pale, an unfortunate wanderer from the paths of justice, she informed him that, by a true confession of his guilt, and sincere repentance forgiveness was to be obtained. With this view expiatory sacrifices were instituted, by means of which the guilty expected to participate in the happiness of the just.”

Such were the views of the ancient Greeks about Hades, or Tartarus, and its punishment. There is considerable similarity in the above quotation to some descriptions given of hell torments by modern preachers. I shall leave all to their own reflection on it. One or two things I shall merely notice.

1st, The doctrine of punishment in *Tartarus*, seems to have originated with legislators, for the purpose of restraining the passions of the multitude, and to alarm “them on all sides with the most frightful representations.” The Persians, Chaldeans, Egyptians, and Greeks, all introduced punishment after death. The Jewish nation is an exception. Some deistical writers have blamed Moses as a legislator for not introducing eternal punishment into his code of laws, as a curb on men against licentiousness. It is generally allowed that the punishments threatened in the Old Testament are of a temporal nature.

2d, From the above quotation it appears, that though

punishment after death in *Tartarus* was believed by the heathen generally, yet the better informed among them did not believe "*in the fables of hell*," but turned them into ridicule. Juvenal took no part in those opinions of the vulgar; and Virgil says—"it was the province of philosophy alone to shake off the yoke of custom, riveted by education." Is it not then strange, that a doctrine, which was invented by heathens, and treated with contempt by their own wisest men, should be a fundamental article in the faith of Christians?

3d, I may just add, that when the heathen were made converts to the Christian faith, all allow, that many of their previous notions were soon incorporated with it. This, together with the erroneous views held by the Jewish converts, laid a foundation for such a corruption of Christianity, which, if it were not attested by evidence indisputable, could not be believed. That punishment in *Tartarus*, is not a part of this corruption of Christianity derived from the heathen, deserves to be seriously considered. The evidence we have adduced, proving that it is, we submit to the reader's judgment.

To conclude this chapter. We have shown, that neither Sheol, Hades, nor *Tartarus*, is ever used by the sacred writers to signify a place of endless misery for the wicked. This was all we were bound to do, in opposing the common opinion on this subject. But we have also shown, that this opinion originated with the heathen; and that the Jews learned it from them. To invalidate the evidence which has been produced, the very reverse must be proved. See note in the first edition, or the improved version on 2 Peter and Jude.



## CHAPTER II.

---

GEHENNA, UNIFORMLY TRANSLATED HELL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, CONSIDERED AS A PLACE OF ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

We have now arrived at a part of this Inquiry, which requires the utmost attention. The New Testament is considered as teaching the doctrine of *endless misery* to all the wicked, and *Gehenna* is the place in which they are said to suffer it. The *truth*, or *falsehood* of this doctrine, is then at issue upon the decision of the question,—*What is the Scripture meaning and usage of the word Gehenna?*

---

### SECTION I.

REMARKS ON DR. CAMPBELL'S VIEWS OF GEHENNA.

WE have seen, from a consideration of all the texts in which *Sheol*, *Hades*, and *Tartarus* occur, that these words never ought to have been translated *hell*, at least in the sense in which it is used by most Christians. This is confirmed by Dr. Campbell, and other writers, who were believers in the doctrine of eternal misery.

The *word*, and I believe the *only word*, which is supposed to express the *place* of *eternal misery* in the

Bible, is the term *Gehenna*. As Dr. Campbell conclusively proves, that Sheol, Hades, and Tartarus, do not mean this place, he as positively asserts, that this is always the sense of *Gehenna* in the New Testament. He thus writes in his 6th preliminary dissertation, part ii. sect. 1.—“That *Gehenna* is employed in the New Testament to denote the place of future punishment, prepared for the devil and his angels, is indisputable. In the Old Testament, we do not find this place in the same manner mentioned. Accordingly, the word *Gehenna* does not occur in the Septuagint. It is not a Greek word, and consequently not to be found in the Grecian classics. It is originally a compound of the two Hebrew words *ge hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem, of which we hear first in the book of Joshua, xv. 8. It was there that the cruel sacrifices of children were made by fire to Moloch, the Ammonitish idol, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6. The place was also called *tophet*, 2 Kings xxiii. 10. and that, as is supposed, from the noise of drums, *toph* signifying a drum, a noise raised on purpose to drown the cries of the helpless infants. As this place was, in process of time, considered as an emblem of hell, or the place of torment reserved for the punishment of the wicked in a future state, the name *tophet* came gradually to be used in this sense, and at length to be confined to it.—This is the sense, if I mistake not, in which *Gehenna* a synonymous term, is always to be understood in the New Testament, where it occurs just twelve times. In ten of these there can be no doubt; in the other two, the expression is figurative; but it scarcely will admit a question, that the figure is taken from that state of misery which awaits the impenitent.” Such is the statement given by Dr. Campbell. It will be easily perceived, that the whole of it is assertion. Resolved, not to take this very important article on bare assertion, I have considered it as carefully as I could, and shall

submit the result of my investigation for candid consideration. It is with reluctance I dissent from such a learned and sensible writer as Dr. Campbell. But he has taught me to call no man master. He encourages free inquiry, and inculcates on his readers, that no doctrine ought to be believed because it is asserted by the learned, and professed by the multitude; but on the evidence whereby it is supported. As this quotation contains, for substance, the views of all who believe *Gehenna* to signify the place of eternal punishment, it is necessary to make some remarks on it in the outset. With all due respect for the memory of Dr. Campbell, I solicit attention to the following remarks on the above quotation.

1st, Let it be observed, how differently he speaks in the first and last part of it. In the first he says,—“that *Gehenna* is employed in the New Testament to denote the place of future punishment, prepared for the devil and his angels, is *indisputable*.” But in the last, he only says,—“this is the sense, *if I mistake not*, in which *Gehenna*, a synonymous term, is always to be understood in the New Testament.” Whether, what he had written between the first and last of these sentences, led him to hesitate about the meaning of *Gehenna*, I cannot say; but sure I am, that he was too shrewd a man not to perceive, and too candid not to own, the insufficiency of the evidence adduced to convince his readers. It is not his usual mode to assert things. He generally states evidence, and seldom fails to convince us. But here he affords us none. In attempting to make out the proof of what he asserts, I have been led to alter my opinion about the meaning of *Gehenna*.

2d, Though Dr. Campbell asserts in the above quotation, that this is *always* the sense of *Gehenna* in the New Testament, yet he denies that it has any support from the Old. He says,—“In the old Testament we do not find this place in the same manner mentioned.

Accordingly the word Gehenna does not occur in the Septuagint.\* It is not a Greek word, and consequently not to be found in the Grecian classics." To me this is very strange. *What! are we to believe without evidence, that the word Gehenna is taken from the Old Testament, and the sense of endless misery affixed to it by the New Testament writers, yet no intimation given of such a change? This we think ought to be indisputably proved, before it be believed by any man.* Unless they explained the word in this new sense, it was impossible, in the very nature of the case, that their hearers could understand them.

3d, But Dr. Campbell attempts to account for such a change in the meaning of Gehenna in the New Testament, from that of the Old, in the following manner. "As this place was, in process of time, considered as an emblem of hell, or the place of torment reserved for the punishment of the wicked in a future state, the name tophet came gradually to be used in this sense, and at length to be confined to it." I am surprised at this statement, from such a writer as Dr. Campbell. Let it be noticed, he does not say that the New Testament writers explained Gehenna to their hearers in this new sense. Nor does he say, that any sacred writer either of the Old or New Testament, made *tophet* an emblem of this place of torment. How then, could tophet become an emblem of hell, the place of torment, until this place was first known by the persons who made it an emblem? But here is one place made the emblem of another, and yet it is confessed that no revelation was given about this place, of which the other place is made the emblem. Yea, it is even declared, that for this very place, the Hebrew, Greek, nor English language has no name. Is it asked how I make this appear? I answer, Dr. Campbell told us above that nei-

\* The word Gehenna does occur in the septuagint, as we may probably show afterwards.

ther Sheol, Hades, nor Tartarus, means this place of torment. In the very quotation on which we are remarking, he declares that Gehenna does not occur in this sense in the Old Testament, that it is not a Greek word, and is not found in the Grecian classics, nor in the Septuagint. He also told us, that our English word hell, did not originally signify the place of eternal punishment for the wicked, but expressed the same *place* as Sheol and Hades. Here then we have got a place, a place of *eternal* punishment for the wicked, but for which the Bible, in the original languages, has no name ; a place, for which even the copious Grecian classics afford no name ; a place, for which our Lord and his apostles could find no name, but were obliged to borrow a word from the Old Testament, affix this new sense to it, and did this without any explanation, or even intimation, to their hearers. They did this too, in addressing Jews who had the Old Testament in their hands ; persons who were opposed to the doctrines they taught, and who were jealous of innovation. Moreover, the change of sense put on this word taken from their Scriptures, is for the purpose of threatening them with *endless* torment in a future state. And to add no more, such persons receive all this without a murmuring word at the alteration, or the dreadful punishment with which they are threatened. All this may be true, but we must say, it is not very probable, nor ought it to be received until very conclusive evidence is produced. But it may be asked, from what source did Dr. Campbell learn, “that tophet or Gehenna came gradually to be used as an emblem of hell, and at length came to be confined to it ?” From what he has said, it was not from the Old Testament. If it was used as an emblem of hell, and confined to it in the days of our Lord, it must have assumed this new sense, between the completion of the Old Testament writings, and the commencement of the gospel dispensation. If it began to assume this new sense be-



fore the Old Testament was completed, it had no authority from it; for he declares, that Gehenna does not occur in this manner in the Old Testament. This new sense, then affixed to the word Gehenna, is not of divine but of human origin: it rests on the authority of man, and not on the authority of God. I think this cannot be denied, unless it is proved, that our Lord informed those to whom he spake, that this was the sense in which it was now to be understood. But is any thing like this to be found in the New Testament? And is not this taking for granted the very thing which ought to be proved?

But further; it must be allowed, that the way Dr. Campbell says Gehenna came to assume this new sense, is extremely suspicious. Had it been of divine authority, it would not have come *gradually* to assume it. No; the sense would have been settled at once. But this new sense affixed to the word, was of slow process. It came, he says, "*gradually to be used as an emblem of hell, and at last to be confined to it.*" At what time it began to be used in this *new* sense, who had the honor of first using it, how long before it came to be confined to it, and who completed it, we are not informed. The thing is barely *asserted* by Dr. Campbell. If any evidence of this is to be found, we must find it, if we can ourselves. We have been at some pains to find evidence of this, but our labors have been entirely fruitless. We are left in the dark, as to when, or by whom, or on what authority such a meaning was first given to *Gehenna*. But it may be said, is it not evident that our Lord used Gehenna *always*, and *indisputably* in this new sense? It is certain, it is indisputable, that Dr. Campbell has *asserted* this, without so much as attempting to prove it. But surely this ought not to be received on the assertions of any man. Only let it be proved that our Lord used Gehenna in this new sense, and I am forever silent on the subject.

But Dr. Campbell has said, "in the Old Testament we do not find this place in the same manner mentioned." May I then be allowed to ask, if this place of torment for the wicked, is not mentioned in the Old Testament, under the name Gehenna, by what other name is it called? He denies that it is called by the names *Sheol*, *Hades*, or *Tartarus*. Yea, he denies that the Hebrew, Greek, or English language affords a name for this place of torment. In his Dissertation, already quoted, he thus writes in regard to the state of the dead. "It is plain that in the Old Testament the most profound silence is observed in regard to the state of the deceased, their joys or sorrows, happiness or misery. It is represented to us rather by negative qualities than by positive; by its silence, its darkness, its being inaccessible, unless by preternatural means, to the living, and their ignorance about it. Thus much in general seems always to have been presumed concerning it; that it is not a state of activity adapted for exertion, or indeed for the accomplishment of any important purpose, good or bad. In most respects, however, there was a resemblance in their notions on this subject, to those of the most ancient heathen." It is obvious from this, that he did not believe, the idea of a place of torment, or the name for it, was known under the Old Testament. Besides, we have seen in a quotation of his, above, that the Jews, from their intercourse with the heathen, learned the notion of punishment in a future state. He not only denies, that the Jews had any knowledge of this from the Old Testament, but he informs us of the source whence they derived their information. Either he must be greatly mistaken in his statements, or endless punishment in hell is a heathen notion, and ought to be rejected by all Christians. But I have to ask further, did our Lord speak to the Jews about Gehenna, in a sense it had not in their sacred books, but in that given it by mere human authority? Did he

use a Scripture word, in a sense which man's wisdom teacheth? Are we to believe, that he who said to the Jews, "full well ye reject the commandment of the Lord, that ye may keep your own traditions," thus gave them countenance by his example? Admitting, for argument's sake, that Gehenna was made the emblem of a place of endless torment, I ask, by what name was it called before this new sense was affixed to the word Gehenna? Dr. Campbell says, that Gehenna came *gradually* to mean this place and at last came to be confined to it. Before this term was then used to express a place of endless misery, was such a place known, and what word or phrase did men use to designate it? Or was it a nameless place, before Gehenna was used as an emblem of it? If so, how could they speak about it? But it seems men came gradually, in process of time, to use Gehenna as an emblem of this place of torment, before they had any revelation about it. We thought places and things were first known, and then names for them followed; but here the matter seems to have been very different. In fact, there is something here which will not bear examination. I ask again, why were not men content to speak of it by the name God had given it, if indeed he had said any thing about it? Or did men first invent this place of torment, and then make *Gehenna* an emblem of it? Unless it is proved, that our Lord did use Gehenna in this new sense, will it not follow that such a place of torment is not mentioned in the Bible by the name *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus*, or *Gehenna*? If it is proved, that he used Gehenna in this sense, does it not follow, that he adopted a heathen notion, and has made it a principal article of belief to all his followers. It may just be added, how could Dr. Campbell with truth say, that *tophet* came gradually to be used as an emblem of hell, the place of future torment, "*and at length to be confined to it?*" It could not be *confined to it* by the Jews in

reading the Old Testament Scriptures. Let any one consult the places where it occurs, and see if it could be so understood by them. If they did, it was a great misunderstanding of the passages; for Dr. Campbell himself declares, that in this sense it does not occur in the Old Testament.

4th, Dr. Campbell declares in the above quotation, that Gehenna does not occur in the Old Testament in the sense of a place of torment for the wicked, yet he gives us the following information about it.—He says —“it is originally a compound of the two Hebrew words, *ge hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem, of which we hear first in the book of Joshua xv. 8. It was there that the cruel sacrifices of children were made by fire to Moloch, the Ammonitish idol, 2 Chron. xxiii. 10. and that, as it is supposed, from the noise of drums, *toph* signifying a drum, a noise raised on purpose to drown the cries of the helpless infants.” —Here, then, is the origin of Gehenna in the New Testament, stated by Dr. Campbell himself. We see, though it does not occur in the sense of a place of torment for the wicked, yet it does occur in the Old Testament in some sense. What this sense is, and what it is there made an *emblem* of by divine authority, ought to be carefully considered, and not departed from, unless very substantial reasons are assigned. We do not think it at all probable, that our Lord would use Gehenna in such a different sense, or make it an *emblem* of such a very different thing from that of the Old Testament writers, if Dr. Campbell himself may be believed in the following quotations. In his fifth Dissertation, part ii. sect. 13. he says,—“Our Lord, we find from the evangelists, spoke to his countrymen in the dialect of their own Scriptures, and used those names to which the reading of the law and the prophets, either in the original, or in the versions then used, had familiarized them. Our translators, and indeed most European translators,

represent him as using words, which, even in their own translations of the Old Testament, never occur, and to which, in fact, there is nothing there that corresponds in meaning." In his first preliminary Dissertation, part I. sect. 1. and 2. he further says,—“if the words and phrases employed by the apostles and evangelists, in delivering the revelation committed to them by the Holy Spirit, had not been agreeable to the received usage of the people to whom they spoke, their discourses, being unintelligible, could have conveyed no information, and consequently would have been no revelation to the hearers. Our Lord and his apostles, in publishing the gospel, first addressed themselves to their countrymen the Jews ; a people who had, many ages before, at different periods, been favored with other revelations. As the writings of the Old Testament are of a much earlier date, and contain an account of the rise and first establishment, together with a portion of the history of the nation to whom the gospel was first promulgated, and of whom were all its first missionaries and teachers, *it is thence unquestionably that we must learn, both what the principal facts, customs, doctrines, and precepts are, that are alluded to in the apostolical writings, and what is the proper signification and extent of the expressions used.*”

In this quotation, it is freely admitted—“Our Lord spoke to his countrymen in the dialect of their own scriptures, and used those names to which the reading of the law and the prophets, either in the original, or in the versions then used, had familiarized them.” But it is universally confessed, that *Gehenna*, does not signify a place of endless punishment in the Old Testament, either in the *original*, or *versions* used in the days of Christ. To say then, that our Lord used *Gehenna* in such a sense, is to “represent him, as using words in a sense, which does not occur in the Old Testament, and to which, in fact, there is nothing there that



corresponds in meaning." This, Dr. Campbell condemns, and declares, that it is to the writings of the Old Testament we must go, to learn—"the proper signification and extent of the expressions used in the new." Let us then have recourse to the Old Testament, to learn the "*signification and extent*" of Gehenna in the New?

What then is the meaning of Gehenna in the Old Testament? In what *sense* or senses is it used there? I answer in the two following, It is used,

1st, *Literally*. Dr. Campbell above, allows, Gehenna in the New Testament—"is originally a compound of the two Hebrew words *ge hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem, of which we hear first in the book of Joshua xv. 8." The word *ge*, or *gia*, signifies a valley, and *enm*, or *Hinnom*, the name of its owner. The following are the places where it thus occurs, which the reader may consult. Josh. xv. 8; xviii. 16. Neh. xi. 30. 2 Chron. xxviii. 3, and xxiii. 6. Jer. xxxii. 35. The reader who consults these texts, will see, that kings and princes, Priests and people, burnt their children to Moloch, and practised the most horrid abominations in the *valley of Hinnom*. The following texts may also be consulted, which refer to the same scenes of wickedness, 1 Kings ii. 4—8. Ezek. xvi. 20, 21. xxiii. 37—39; xx. 26—31. Amos v. 26. Acts vii. 43. It appears from the following texts, that it was death by the law of Moses, for any man to sacrifice his children to Moloch, Levit. xviii. 21. Comp. xx. 1—6.

In this valley of Hinnom was *Tophet*, concerning which Calmet thus writes. "It is thought Tophet was the butchery, or place of slaughter at Jerusalem, lying south of the city, in the valley of the children of Hinnom. It is also said, that a constant fire was kept here, for burning the carcasses, and other filth, brought hither from the city. Into the same place they cast the ashes

and remains of the images of false gods, when they demolished their altars, and statues. Isai. xxx. 33, seems to allude to this custom, of burning dead carcasses in tophet. When speaking of the defeat of the army of Sennacherib, he says ; ‘ for tophet is ordained of old ; yea, for the king it is prepared ; he hath made it deep and large ; the pile thereof is fire, and much wood ; the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone doth kindle it.’\*—Others think, the name of tophet is given to the valley of Hinnom, because of the sacrifices offered there to the god Moloch, by beat of drum, to drown the cries of the consuming children.”—The idol god Moloch was worshipped in the valley of Hinnom. On the word Moloch, Calmet says :—“ The rabbins assure us, that the idol Moloch was of brass, sitting on a throne of the same metal, adorned with a royal crown, having the head of a calf, and his arms extended as if to embrace any one. When they would offer any children to him, they heated the statue within by a great fire ; and when it was burning hot, they put the miserable victim within his arms, where it was soon consumed by the violence of the heat ; and, that the cries of the children might not be heard, they made a great noise with drums, and other instruments, about the idol. Others say, that his arms were extended, and reaching toward the ground ; so that when they put a child within his arms, it immediately fell into a great fire which was burning at the foot of the statue. Others relate that it was hollow, and had internally seven partitions, the first of which was appointed for meal or flour ; in the second there were turtles, in the third an ewe, in the fourth a ram, in the fifth a calf, in the sixth an ox, and in the

\* Parkhurst renders this text thus—“ for the furnace *is already set in order* : for the king (of Assyria namely), it is prepared” etc. But was *hell* prepared for this king ? and if it refers to hell in another world—“ the pile thereof is fire and much wood.” We have heard this text quoted, to prove a *hell* in another world.

seventh a child. All these were burned together, by heating the statue on the inside."

In 2 Kings xxiii. 10, we are told, that at the time of Josiah's reformation, "he defiled tophet which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Moloch." Concerning this Prof. Stuart says, p. 141—"after these sacrifices had ceased, the place was desecrated, and made one of loathing and horror. The pious king Josiah caused it to be polluted, 2 Kings xxiii. 10, i. e. he caused to be carried there the filth of the city of Jerusalem. It would seem that the custom of desecrating this place, thus happily begun, was continued in after ages down to the period when our Savior was on earth. Perpetual fires was kept up, in order to consume the offal which was deposited there, and as the same offal would breed worms, (for so all putrefying meat of course does, hence came the expression, "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Such is the origin of the phraseology, in Mark ix. 42—47, by Mr. Stuart's own showing, which will be considered below. "The worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched" was not in a future state, but in the valley of Hinnom. But I find *gia enm*, or *the valley of Hinnom*, used in the Old Testament.

2d, *Symbolically*. By comparing the texts referred to above, with their contexts, it will be seen, that on account of the crimes committed in the valley of Hinnom, God threatened to bring on the Jewish nation severe punishment, as the valley of Hinnom, or tophet, was the place where their horrid abominations had been committed, so it is used as a *symbol* or *figure*, to describe their punishment. This is done by Jeremiah chap. xix. and chap. vii. to the end, which I shall now quote.

"Thus saith the Lord, go and get a potter's earthen bottle, and *take* of the ancients of the people, and of the ancients of the priests; and go forth unto the valley of

the son of Hinnom, which is by the entry of the east gate, and proclaim there the words that I shall tell thee ; and say, Hear ye the word of the Lord, O kings of Judah, and inhabitants of Jerusalem ; thus saith the Lord of hosts ; the God of Israel : Behold, I will bring evil upon this place, the which, whosoever heareth, his ears shall tingle. Because they have forsaken me, and have estranged this place, and have burned incense in it unto other gods, whom neither they nor their fathers have known, nor the kings of Judah, and have filled this place with the blood of innocents ; they have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire *for* burnt offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake *it*, neither came *it* into my mind ; therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that this place shall no more be called tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter. And I will make void the counsel of Judah and Jerusalem in this place ; and I will cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hands of them that seek their lives ; and their carcasses will I give to be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth. And I will make this city desolate, and an hissing ; every one that passeth thereby shall be astonished, and hiss because of all the plagues thereof. And I will cause them to eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat every one the flesh of his friend in the seige and straightness, where-with their enemies, and they that seek their lives, shall straiten them. Then shalt thou break the bottle in the sight of the men that go with thee, and shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts ; Even so will I break this people and this city, as *one* breaketh a potter's vessel, that cannot be made whole again : and they shall bury *them* in tophet, till *there be* no place to bury. Thus will I do unto this place, saith the Lord, and to the inhabitants thereof, and *even* make this city as to-

phet: and the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses of the kings of Judah, shall be defiled as the place of tophet, because of all the houses upon whose roofs they have burned incense unto all the host of heaven, and have poured out drink offerings unto other gods. Then came Jeremiah from tophet, whither the Lord had sent him to prophesy; and he stood in the court of the Lord's house; and said to all the people, thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold, I will bring upon this city and upon all her towns all the evil that I have pronounced against it, because they have hardened their necks, that they might not hear my words." Chap. vii. ver. 29—34.—"Cut off thine hair, *O Jerusalem*, and cast *it* away, and take up a lamentation on high places; for the Lord hath rejected and forsaken the generation of his wrath. For the children of Judah have done evil in my sight, saith the Lord: they have set their abominations in the house which is called by my name, to pollute it. And they have built the high places of tophet, which *is* in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded *them* not, neither came it into my heart. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter; for they shall bury in tophet till there be no place. And the carcasses of this people shall be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth; and none shall fray *them* away. Then will I cease from the cities of Judah, and from the streets of Jerusalem, the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride: for the land shall be desolate."

No one can doubt, after reading these two quotations, that the Old Testament writers made the valley of Hinnom or tophet, an emblem of *punishment*, and of *future punishment*, but *not of future eternal punishment*. It



is equally evident, that they made it an emblem of *future temporal punishment to the Jews as a nation*. Not a word is dropped, that this punishment was to be in a future state of existence. No ; it is a prediction of miseries to be endured by the *Jews*, for their sins. It is not mentioned as a punishment for wicked men generally, or for Jews and Gentiles indiscriminately. No ; the Jews, as a nation, were to suffer this punishment. In this prediction they are reminded of the crimes they had committed against the Lord, in the valley of Hinnom, and it is used as an emblem of the punishment he was to inflict upon them. This is very apparent from the following verses in the above quoted passages, Jer. chap. vii. 20, 21, and xix. 4, 5. No man, we think, can read these predictions of the prophet, without recognizing, that our Lord in the following texts, referred to the same punishment. "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except these days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled," Matth. xxiii. 35, and xxiv. 21, 22. Luke xxi. 22. Yes, the days referred to, were indeed the days of vengeance, and the things which God had long predicted, were fulfilled, and the above quoted predictions of Jeremiah, were surely of the number. But, that we may see more particularly, what Jeremiah made Gehenna or tophet an emblem of, it is necessary to point this out by going over the above predictions.

1st, The prophet predicts, that the valley of Hinnom, should be to the Jews the valley of slaughter, and that they should bury in tophet till there should be no place to bury. In proof of its exact fulfilment, I quote

the following from Macknight on Math. chap. xxiv. He says:—"besides, in the progress of the siege, the number of the dead, and the stench arising from their unburied carcasses, must have infected the air, and occasioned pestilence. For Josephus tells us that there were no less than six hundred thousand dead bodies carried out of the city, and suffered to lie unburied." It should be recollected, that the valley of Hinnom was in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem.—We see then this part of Jeremiah's prediction literally and minutely fulfilled.

2d, Jeremiah further predicts, "that their carcasses also should be meat for the fowls of heaven and for the beasts of the earth." If the fowls of the air, and beasts of the field, did not feed on their carcasses, it was not for want of opportunity, for six hundred thousand of their carcasses lay unburied. This part of the prediction was also literally fulfilled.

3d, Jeremiah also predicts, that "in the straitness of the siege, they should eat the flesh of their children." This was also fulfilled in the siege of Jerusalem, as Josephus, their historian, testifies.

4th, He further predicts, that "their land should be desolate." This it soon became after the destruction of the city and temple, and in this state, in a great measure, it remains until this day.

5th, Again, the prophet predicts, "that their city should be as tophet." We have seen, that he said before, "the valley of Hinnom should be to them the valley of slaughter, and that they should bury in tophet till there should be no place to bury." It is evident, from the prophet's prediction, that the city of Jerusalem should be as tophet or like unto tophet. Tophet, is used as an emblem, to describe the misery in which it was to be involved by the judgments of God. And why, it may be asked, was tophet made an emblem of those temporal miseries, rather than any thing else?

To this I answer, that no temporal miseries since the world began, or ever shall be, could equal them in severity, and no place known to a Jew, could be more fitly chosen by the prophet, as an emblem to represent them.

6th, The prophet adds, that “all the evil which the Lord had spoken he would bring upon them.” The following words of the apostle, 1 Thess. ii. 16, sufficiently explain this,—“for the wrath is come, or coming upon them to the uttermost.”—And the words of our Lord, quoted above,—“for these be the days of vengeance, that all things that are written may be fulfilled.” Luke xxi. 22. This part of the prediction, compared with these passages, show, that the prophet did refer to the dreadful punishment which God brought upon the Jewish nation at the end of the world, or age, and described, Matth. xxiv. For “all the evil which the Lord had spoken,” he did not bring upon them, until the destruction of their city and temple by the Roman army.

Such are the principal things contained in this prophesy of Jeremiah. It is then put beyond all fair debate, that Gehenna was made an emblem of punishment to the Jews; and nothing but ignorance of their own Scriptures, could prevent their fully knowing this. It was made an *emblem of temporal punishment*, and a very striking emblem indeed. But that it was made an emblem of *eternal punishment* to the *Jews*, or *any of the human race*, does not appear from this prophesy of Jeremiah, or any other part of the Bible. We hope these things will be kept in view, as they have a very important bearing on the passages about Gehenna in the New Testament. Gehenna, the valley of Hinnom, or tophet, is made by Jeremiah an emblem of the temporal calamities coming on the Jewish nation. That in this very way, it is used in the New Testament, we shall show when we come to consider the passages

where it occurs. Dr. Campbell, is so far correct then in saying, that Gehenna was made *an emblem of punishment*, but is certainly mistaken in saying, that it was made an emblem of *future eternal punishment for the devil and his angels*, or any other beings in the universe. Supposing, Gehenna to have been made an emblem of the place of *eternal* torment to the wicked, it is certain, it was not done by the Old Testament writers. Dr. Campbell assures us, that in this manner it does not occur in the Old Testament. That he is correct in this, is plain from the places in which it occurs. Is it not then deserving particular notice, that the Old Testament writers should use the term Gehenna, as an *emblem of temporal* and not of *eternal punishment*; and yet we are told, that in process of time it came to be used as an emblem of *eternal punishment*; but no man can tell us on whose authority this was done?

---

## SECTION II.

FACTS STATED RESPECTING GEHENNA, THAT IT DOES NOT EXPRESS A PLACE OF ENDLESS PUNISHMENT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Before we consider the texts, where Gehenna occurs in the New Testament, it is of importance to notice the following facts. They have been altogether overlooked, or but little attended to in discussions on this subject.

1st, *The term Gehenna, is not used in the Old Testament, to designate a place of endless punishment to the wicked.* This fact is so palpable, that Dr. Campbell, declares positively, *Gehenna* has no such meaning there. All admit this fact; which ought to lead all, to

examine carefully, if Gehenna in the New Testament, can mean a *place* of endless misery. We ought not to take this for granted; but be sure we correctly understand the passages which speak of Gehenna. This has been too long believed without any examination. The admitted fact, that Gehenna has no such sense in the Old Testament, ought to create the suspicion, that the sense of Gehenna is misunderstood in the New.

2d, *It is also a fact, that those who believe Gehenna, designates a place of endless punishment in the New Testament, entirely overlooked its meaning in the Old.* All admit, its literal original signification to be, *the valley of Hinnom*. But not one of them takes the least notice, that Gehenna was used also by Jeremiah, as *a source of imagery, or emblem*, to describe the punishment God threatened to the Jewish nation. But why overlook this sense of Gehenna in the Old Testament? Is it not *possible*, yea, is it not *probable*, that this may be its sense in the New? All critics admit, the language of the New Testament is derived from the old, and ought to be interpreted by it.

3d, *The fact is also notorious, that those who believe Gehenna in the New Testament, designates a place of endless punishment, give it this sense on mere human authority.* Dr. Campbell above, says, Gehenna came gradually to assume this sense, and at last came to be confined to it. But no *divine authority* is referred to, for the origin of this sense attached to the term Gehenna. Professor Stuart, refers to the later Jews, the Rabbinical writers, as authority. And finally tells us — “Gehenna came to be used as a designation of the infernal regions, because the Hebrews supposed that demons dwelt in this valley.” But who can believe, the term Gehenna in the New Testament, is used in a sense which originated in a silly superstitious notion?

4th, *Another fact is, the word Gehenna only occurs twelve times in the New Testament.* The following are



all the texts, Math. v. 22, 29, 30, and xviii. 9. Mark ix. 43—47. Luke xii. 5. Math. x. 28, and xxiii. 15, 33. James iii. 6. The rendering of *Gehenna* in these texts, is uniformly *hell* in the common version. The fact, that *Gehenna*, is only used twelve times, in the New Testament deserves notice, for Dr. Campbell and others say, this is the only word in the Bible, which designates a *place* of *endless* punishment. Now, supposing this to be true, do most Christians know, that their place of endless punishment, is only mentioned twelve times there? But correctly speaking, *Gehenna* was not used even twelve times originally. It occurs eleven times in the Gospels of Mathew, Mark, and Luke, which all know, are only three histories of the same discourses in which *Gehenna* was used by our Lord. Viewing the subject in this light, few words of such importance, occur so seldom in the New Testament as the word *Gehenna*. I notice this, to show the difference, between our Lord and modern preachers as to the frequency of their use of the word *hell*, which is the rendering of *Gehenna*. Allowing it used twelve times in the New Testament, this is not so often, as many preachers use it in the course of a single sermon. That they never ought to use the texts, in which *Gehenna* occurs, in proof of a place of endless punishment, we shall show afterwards.

5th, *The fact is also indisputable, that the word Gehenna is used by our Lord, and by James, but by no other person in the New Testament.* Any person who can read English, may satisfy himself of the correctness of this fact, by reading the texts referred to above. John, wrote the history of our Lord, as well as Mathew, Mark, and Luke, but he never speaks of *Gehenna*, either in his Gospel or Epistles. What is more remarkable, Luke, though he uses *Gehenna* once in his Gospel, never uses it in the Acts, which contains the history of the Apostles' preaching for thirty years.

Paul, Peter, and Jude, are entirely silent about Gehenna, which is very strange, if it designated a place of endless punishment to the wicked. The writings of those persons, who have never mentioned Gehenna, form two thirds of the New Testament. But surely, it is a very natural expectation, warranted by the frequency of other important subjects mentioned, that all the writers in the New Testament should often speak of Gehenna, if it did mean a place of endless misery. And if they did believe this, yet were silent about it, they were not so faithful to their hearers as most modern preachers. But can any man believe, our Lord's disciples understood him to mean by *Gehenna* a place of endless misery, yet most of them never said a word about it in their preaching, or in their letters to the churches? Is it at all propable, that they would lay aside the term Gehenna, used by their Lord to designate a place of endless misery, and adopt some other language to express it? We strongly doubt this.

6th, *But another striking fact is, all that is said about Gehenna in the New Testament, was spoken to Jews, and to Jews only.* No Gentile, is ever threatened with Gehenna punishment. This fact is indisputable, which every person can satisfy himself about, by simply reading the texts where Gehenna is used, with their respective contexts. It is of no consequence to decide, to whom the Gospels were originally addressed, for in the eleven places where our Lord used the term Gehenna, it is certain he was speaking to *Jews*. And in the only other place where Gehenna occurs, it is certain, James wrote to the twelve tribes which were scattered abroad. James i. 1, Comp. Chap. iii 6. It forms no objection to this fact—"That our Lord's ministry was among the Jews, and not among the Gentiles, hence could not say to the Gentiles as to the Jews—'how can ye escape the damnation of hell, (Gehenna).'" The Apostles' ministry was among the Gentiles;

but they never say any thing to them about Gehenna in any shape whatever, which shows, that "the damnation of Gehenna," only concerned the Jews. This fact, is of great importance in the present investigation, and is beyond all dispute. Let us then attach what sense we please to the term Gehenna, it is certain, *Jews* are the only persons addressed about it, or concerned in its punishment. As proof of this, it may be observed that Matthew, Mark, and Luke, are thought to have written their Gospels for the use of the Jews, and in them *Gehenna* is used. It seems certain, John wrote his Gospel for the use of the Gentiles, for he explains Jewish places, names, and customs, altogether unnecessary, had he wrote it to Jews. But it deserves special notice, John never mentions Gehenna, and omits all the discourses of our Lord, in which he spoke of Gehenna. If the damnation of Gehenna, or hell, only concerned Jews, we see a good reason for such an omission; but if it equally concerned the Gentiles, how shall any man account for the omission, on rational and scriptural principles. If Jews and Gentiles, were alike concerned in the punishment of Gehenna, why were not both alike admonished concerning it? How, I ask, could the Gentiles avoid the punishment of Gehenna, seeing no sacred writer said any thing to them about it? Does not this very omission prove, that the New Testament writers, did not mean by Gehenna a place of endless misery, but that it designated the temporal punishment which Jeremiah predicted to the Jewish nation.

To the above, it may possibly be objected—"were not all the scriptures written for the benefit of mankind? Why then make this distinction between Jews and Gentiles?" Answer. Whatsoever was written aforetime was written for our instruction. But notwithstanding this, who does not make this very distinction? As Gentiles, we may derive much instruction from Math. Chaps. 23d and 24th, but who does not allow, these two Chap-

ters had a particular reference to the Jews? In the first, some of the most important things occur, which our Lord ever delivered respecting Gehenna. Who does not allow the words,—“Fill ye up then the measure of your Fathers,” had a special reference to the Jews as a nation? But why not also the very next words—“ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell.” And as this is the only instance, where our Lord ever threatened the *unbelieving* Jews with the “*damnation of Gehenna*,” and no sacred writer ever threatened the Gentiles with it, who can doubt this punishment only respected Jews? I then appeal to every candid man, whether this fact, ought not to lead us all to suspect, that our Lord by Gehenna, meant the temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation, and not a place of endless punishment for the wicked. The man who can avoid such a suspicion, must have some way of accounting, for this and other facts, of which I am ignorant.

7th, *Another important fact is, nearly all that our Lord said about Gehenna, was spoken to his own disciples.* In the twelve places where Gehenna occurs, only in two instances, is a word said about it to the unbelieving part of the Jewish nation. In nine of the other instances, our Lord was addressing his own disciples. They are the persons principally warned about the punishment of Gehenna. In the only other instance, James was addressing believing Jews of the twelve tribes scattered abroad. The texts referred to above, need only to be read, which will satisfy the reader as to the correctness of these statements. I then ask, if our Lord by Gehenna, meant a place of endless misery, why was he so solicitous, that his few disciples should escape this punishment; yet said so little concerning it to the unbelieving multitude? How is this to be rationally and scripturally accounted for? Besides, he always spoke about Gehenna to his disciples as a thing

they might escape ; but to the unbelieving Jews, he said—"how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Why warn those so often, who were in the least danger of Gehenna punishment, yet only threaten *once* those in the greatest danger of it, if the common opinions on the subject are correct? Our Lord's conduct, and the conduct of preachers in the present day, are at perfect variance about this. What preacher now, shows more solicitude, that the few in his church, should be saved from Gehenna or hell, than the multitude he considers living in disobedience? The very reverse of this, is the conduct of modern preachers. Why, they act so different from our Lord, I must leave for others to explain. I am satisfied, that this never can be rationally and scripturally accounted for, on the common opinions which are entertained respecting Gehenna punishment. I may add, either our Lord said a great deal too little about *Gehenna*, or *hell* to the wicked, or modern preachers say a great deal too much. Which of these is the truth, must be left for themselves to determine. This, with the other facts above, must create more than a doubt, that Gehenna in the New Testament does not mean a place of endless punishment.

8th, *But another fact, deserving some notice is, wherever Gehenna is mentioned in the New Testament, the persons addressed are supposed to be perfectly acquainted with its meaning.* No explanation is asked by the hearer, none is given by the speaker, nor is it supposed by either to be necessary. The *Jews*, were always the persons addressed about Gehenna. The first time our Lord addressed his disciples about it, Math. v. 22, they had no more occasion to ask him what he meant by Gehenna, than what he meant by the Judgment and council. And when he said to the unbelieving Jews—"How can ye escape the damnation of Gehenna," they understood him as well, what punishment he meant, as if he had spoken of stoning to death. If all



this be true, and we think it is indisputable, the question arises—did the Jews our Lord addressed, understand Gehenna to mean a place of endless misery? As this is generally asserted, I have a right to ask, from what source of information, did they learn this sense of the word Gehenna? I can think of no other sources, from which they could possibly derive it, but some one or other of the following.

1st, *From immediate inspiration.* But no evidence of this can be produced; nor is it even alleged, by those who contend Gehenna in the New Testament means a place of endless punishment. No man will assert this, who has considered the subject.

2d, *The Preaching of John the Baptist.* But this cannot be alleged, for John never said a word about Gehenna in his preaching, if a correct account is given of it in the New Testament.

3d, *The instructions or explanations of the Savior.* This, no man will aver, who has read the four Gospels, for our Lord never explained Gehenna to mean a place of endless punishment.

4th, *The Old Testament Scriptures.* This the Jews, nor no other persons could do; for all admit, Gehenna is not used in the Old Testament to designate a place of endless misery. Dr. Campbell above declared, that Gehenna in this sense, is not to be found in the Old Testament.

5th, *The assertions of fallible uninspired men.* This is the source, from whence originated, the sense now given to Gehenna—a place of endless misery to the wicked. Indeed, no higher authority is quoted than this; no one contends that God first gave it such a sense. Dr. Campbell said above—"Gehenna in process of time came to be used in this sense, and at length came to be confined to it." And Professor Stuart refers us to Rabbinical writers as his authority, that Gehenna in the New Testament means a place of endless punishment.

In fact, he traces the origin of this sense given to Gehenna, to the silly superstition among the Jews, who thought *demons* dwelt in the valley of Hinnom. Such is the way, the believers in endless hell torments say, Gehenna came to have such a sense attached to it. We presume, no man can devise a better.

But let us suppose, the Jews understood our Lord, by Gehenna to mean a place of endless punishment. How were they likely to relish such a threatening? Not very well, for we shall see afterwards from Dr. Whitby, that the Jews believed, no Jew, however wicked, would go to hell. I ask then, how it was possible for our Lord to say to the unbelieving Jews—"How can ye escape the damnation of hell, without exciting their wrath and indignation against him? But nothing is said in the four Gospels, that this threatening excited their indignation; or that it was ever brought up as an accusation against him.

There is no evidence, that the unbelieving Jews, understood our Lord in one sense, and the disciples in another. No; nor have we ever seen or heard, that this has been alleged by any one. How then did both understand him? I answer this question, by asking, how ought they to have understood him according to the meaning of Gehenna in their own scriptures? Certainly, either as meaning the *literal valley of Hinnom*, or *symbolically*, describing to them the punishment God had threatened their nation, as seen from Jeremiah above. In no other sense was Gehenna used in their Scriptures. In the last of these senses they must have understood him; for when our Lord spoke to them of Gehenna, it was the *punishment* of Gehenna, and that such a punishment had been threatened by Jeremiah, no Jew could be ignorant, who was acquainted with the Scriptures. If the Scriptures, were the common source of information, both to believing and unbelieving Jews, none of them could understand our Lord by Gehenna

punishment, to mean endless punishment in a future state, for they contained no such information. Those who contend, the Jews so understood our Lord, are bound to inform us how they came by this information, seeing it was not found in their Scriptures. Who taught them this doctrine? Was it from heaven or of men? These are the questions at issue. To *assume* that Gehenna means a place of endless punishment, will not satisfy candid enquirers after truth. And to refer them to Rabbinical authority for this sense of Gehenna, is plainly admitting, it cannot be supported by a fair appeal to the Bible.

We have some additional facts to produce, to show, that Gehenna in the New Testament, does not designate a place of endless misery to the wicked. But these will be more appropriately introduced, after we have considered, all the texts in the New Testament where Gehenna occurs.

---

### SECTION III.

#### ALL THE TEXTS, IN WHICH GEHENNA OCCURS, CONSIDERED.

The term *Gehenna* in the New Testament, designates *punishment* as all admit, but the question is—what is the nature of that punishment? Does it express a *place* of endless punishment, as Dr. Campbell and others assert? Or, is it used there as a source of imagery, to describe God's judgments on the Jewish nation, in the destruction of their city and temple?

Some indeed have alleged, that Gehenna in the New Testament might refer, to—"that dreadful doom of being burned alive in the valley of Hinnom." But this

is far from being probable, for burning alive in the valley of Hinnom, was not a Roman punishment; and in our Lord's day, the Jews had not the power to put any man legally to death, by any mode of punishment whatever. Burning alive in the valley of Hinnom was unknown among the Jews. To this horrid practice then, I think our Lord could not allude, when he threatened them with the damnation of Gehenna.

Schleusner observes, that among the Jews—"any severe punishment, especially a shameful kind of death, was denominated Gehenna." If this remark is correct, it well agrees with the prediction of Jeremiah noticed above. He had used Gehenna, as a source of imagery, to describe the punishment to be inflicted on the Jewish nation; when on them came all the righteous blood shed on the earth. That this punishment was *severe* is certain. Our Lord declared,—“for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved,” Math. xxiv. 21, 22. Josephus said above, six hundred thousand dead bodies were carried out of Jerusalem and suffered to lie unburied. Their punishment then, was both *severe* and *shameful*, and might well be denominated *Gehenna*, for no place was more horrible to Jews, than the valley of Hinnom. It was a fit emblem to describe their punishment.

It cannot be *consistently* objected by believers in endless punishment, that the inspired writers made Gehenna an *emblem* of the temporal punishment which came on the Jewish nation, seeing they make it an *emblem* of endless punishment in a future state. To adopt the words of Mr. Stuart—"what could be a more appropriate term than this, when we consider the horrid cruelties and diabolical rites which had been there performed," to describe the horrible carnage of the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple. But, let us

attend to the passages, and see how they agree to this view of the subject?

Math. v. 22. "But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother *raca*, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell, (Gehenna) fire." This is the first time Gehenna is mentioned in the New Testament, and here, our Lord addressed his own disciples about it. If it means *hell*, *the world of woe*, I ask, were they in so much more danger of going to hell than the unbelieving Jews, that he first warned them about it? Yea, was their condition so perilous, that the chief thing, said about Gehenna, was addressed to them? But the passage, or its context, affords no proof, that our Lord by Gehenna referred to a place of punishment in a future state. This sense of Gehenna is assumed, and in face of evidence to the contrary, as I shall now show.

1st, In the passage, there are three crimes, and three punishments mentioned. No one supposes, the two first refer to a future state. Why then should the third? Is the crime of calling a brother a fool, so much worse than the other two, that it puts the person "in danger of *hell*, or, *endless punishment*?"

2d, The question then is, what did our Lord mean by *Gehenna fire*, or as Mr. Stuart renders it—"the fire of the valley of *Hinnom*?" He says—"it is employed as a source of imagery, to describe the punishment of a future world, which the judge of all hearts and intentions will inflict." But this is assuming the question in discussion; and deserves no regard. Above, Schleusner told us—"any severe punishment, especially a shameful kind of death, was denominated Gehenna." Jeremiah, we have seen, describes the punishment of the Jews as a nation under the emblem of Gehenna. This punishment was at hand, when our Lord address-



ed his disciples in this passage. What then did he mean by "Gehenna fire?" I answer, nothing can be more obvious than this from the Bible, that *fire* is a common figure to express God's judgments on men for their sins. No man can doubt this, who consults the following among other passages, Deut. xxxii. 22, 25. Isai. lxvi. 15, 16. v. 24, 25. xxx. 27—33. ix. 18, 19. x. 16—18. Ezek. xxii. 18—22, 41. See also the two first chapters of Amos. I shall only quote one or two examples in proof, respecting the Jews. Jeremiah, Lam. ii. 3, says—"God burned against Jacob like a flaming fire, which devoureth round about." And David says, Ps. lxxxix. 46, "shall thy wrath burn like fire?" It is contended by believers in endless misery, that what is expressed by the word *punishment*, Math. xxv. 46, is described figuratively by the word *fire*, verse 41. Thus according to the figurative use of the term *fire*, and according to Schleusner quoted above, "Gehenna fire" means "any severe punishment, especially a shameful kind of death." And we can be at no loss in determining, to what punishment our Lord referred, as Jeremiah under the emblem of Gehenna, predicted a most severe punishment to the Jewish nation. Where could he have found a more appropriate emblem than Gehenna? It was certainly a more appropriate term, to describe God's temporal punishment of the Jews, than to describe an eternal punishment in a future state, of which we know nothing, for no description of it is given in the Bible.

3d, Let us inquire, what *Gehenna fire* our Lord's disciples were in danger of? That they were in danger of the punishment, God was about to inflict on their nation, no one will dispute. See how careful our Lord was, Math. 24. in pointing out to them how they might escape this punishment. He tells them verse 13—"he that shall endure unto the end the same shall be saved." Saved from what? The context clearly

shows, they would be saved from this punishment coming on their nation. But the utmost watchfulness on their part was necessary, for this day of vengeance would come upon the nation unawares, Math. xxiv. 42—51. Comp. 1 Thess. v. 1—10. But, where does our Lord show like earnestness, in warning his disciples, that they might escape *Gehenna fire*, or endless misery in a future state? No where, as all must confess, and yet most said about *Gehenna* is to them.

The following objection may perhaps be urged against the above view of this passage. “Allowing *Gehenna* to refer to the temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation, why did calling a brother a fool, subject to this punishment, rather than the other crimes mentioned?” Answer. As *Gehenna fire*, or God’s temporal judgments on the Jews, is the greatest punishment mentioned in the passage, we may expect that the crime of which it is the punishment, was also the greatest. The word *moreh* rendered *fool*, Dr. Campbell renders *miscreant*; and in his preface to Mathew’s Gospel, says, “the word *moreh* here used by the evangelist, differs only in number from *morim*, the compellation with which Moses and Aaron addressed the people of Israel, when they said, Numb. xx. 10, with manifest and indecent passion, as rendered in the English Bible, *Hear now ye rebels*, and were, for their punishment, not permitted to enter the land of Canaan. The word, however, as it is oftener used to imply rebellion against God than against any earthly sovereign; and as it includes disbelief of his word, as well as disobedience to his command, I think better rendered in this place *miscreant*, which is also, like the original term, expressive of the greatest abhorrence and detestation. In this way translated the gradation of crimes, as well as of punishments, is preserved, and the impropriety avoided of delivering a moral precept, of consequence to men of all denominations, in words intelligible only to the learned.”

Math. v. 28, 29. "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell, (Gehenna). And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee, that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell, (Gehenna)." Here again, our Lord was addressing his own disciples; and whatever was meant by Gehenna in verse 22, the same must be meant here as all will allow. Let us then enquire 1st, What our Lord meant by Gehenna? On this text Mr. Stuart says—"Most certainly this cannot be understood of a *literal casting* into Gehenna; for who was to execute such a punishment? Not the Jewish courts; for they had no cognizance of the offense which a man's right hand or right eye moved him to commit, i. e. they could not call in question and punish a member of the human body, because it tempted its owner to sin. It must then be a punishment which God would inflict. But was this a *literal* casting into the valley of Hinnom? It may however be said, that the caution of the Savior runs thus:—'Avoid all temptation to sin, lest you bring on yourself the terrible punishment of being burned in the valley of Hinnom, in case you give way to any temptation.' This would be a possible interpretation, provided the crimes in question could be shown to be of such a nature as were punishable in this manner by the Jewish courts. But as this cannot be done, this exegesis seems to be fairly incapable of admission." On this quotation I remark.

1st, We perfectly agree with Mr. Stuart, that—this cannot be understood of "the terrible punishment of being burned in the valley of Hinnom." And we also agree with him, that—"it must then be a punishment which God would inflict." But we ask, does God in-

flict no punishment, but that of casting the *whole body* into hell the world of woe? But,

2d, What does *Gehenna* in this passage mean? It is here used twice, but without the word *fire* being added. It is no doubt understood, however, from verse 22, noticed above, to which I here refer. Our Lord's warning here is more alarming, for he says twice, "And not that thy whole body should be cast into hell, (*Gehenna*)."

But to understand him as meaning, that their whole body should be cast into a place of endless misery, is inadmissible. This sense of the term is entirely assumed, for nothing in the text or its context, leads to such a sense. But it does not accord with the facts of the case; for an instance was never known, of an individual having his *whole body*, or *soul and body*, cast into a place of endless misery. This is not done surely at any man's death, as every sexton in the world can testify. And to say, it shall be done at the resurrection of the dead, is not only an unsupported assertion, but is contrary to all the texts which speak of the resurrection. It does not even accord with modern preaching. What preacher tells his audience, that their *whole bodies* are to be cast into *hell, the world of woe*? If it is to be done at the resurrection, then *immortal, incorruptible bodies*, are to be cast into this place of endless misery. Besides, *Christians* are in great danger of this, for be it remembered, Christ was not speaking here to wicked people, but to his own disciples. But are modern Christians much alarmed, that their *whole body* is to be cast into endless misery? But, let us understand our Lord here, using *Gehenna* as Jeremiah did, as a source of imagery to describe the punishment God was about to inflict on the Jewish nation, and all is plain and consistent. When it came upon them, there was even a *literal* casting into the valley of Hinnom. Did not Jeremiah say, the valley of Hinnom was to be to the Jews the valley of slaughter; and that they should bury in

Tophet, till there was no place. And does not Josephus declare, six hundred thousand of the carcasses of the Jews were cast out of Jerusalem and lay unburied? And who will deny, God inflicted this punishment, although he used human agents to accomplish it? Viewing the subject in this light, we see a very good reason, for what our Lord here said to his disciples about Gehenna. If any thing, dear to them as a right eye or right hand, proved a temptation to sin or apostacy, they must part with it. This was *profitable* to them, for only he who endured to the end should be saved. If they continued faithful, and obeyed his instructions, they should escape the damnation of Gehenna, that punishment which the unbelieving part of the nation could not escape. See on Math. x. 28, and 23, 33, below.

Math. x. 28. "Fear not them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him, which is able to destroy both soul and body in Hell, (Gehenna)." The following are all the remarks Mr. Stuart is pleased to make on this passage. "The body might, indeed be *literally* burned in the valley of Hinnom; but the *immaterial, immortal* soul—is that to be *literally* burned there?" But in reply to this question of his we answer no; for no Universalist holds any such opinion, as we think Mr. Stuart ought to know. But we ask him in turn—how is he to punish the *whole body*, or *soul and body* in his hell, without *fire* or some other means of torment? If soul and body are to be tormented there, why not employ *fire*, just as well as any thing else to do it? Was not his hell, long considered a place of literal fire and brimstone? Do not some still speak of it as such? Is his *immaterial immortal soul*, to be burned there? But let the punishment of his hell be what he pleases, if it is taught in this text, *soul and body* according to his views, are to be destroyed there. But we have shown above, that this is contrary to scripture, facts, and common opinions on this subject.



But we ask Mr. Stuart—where do the scriptures speak about an “*immaterial, immortal soul*? No where. Why then does he do it? Has he forgotten, that he told us *psuhe*, Acts, ii. 29, which is the same word for *soul* in this text, means *me*. So also its corresponding word *Nephish* Psal. xvi. 10. Until he proves, man has an *immaterial, immortal soul*, it is premature to speak of it as being burned in any place. If he can prove this, he can do more than we have ever seen done by any man, and hope he will do it without delay.

But let us attend to the passage, and see what our Lord meant to teach by it? Here, as in the preceding texts, he addressed his own disciples; and is teaching them how to conduct themselves in preaching to the world. The text and its context show, he was not speaking to them on the subject of a future state, but fortifying their minds in view of the difficulties they were about to encounter. The passage says 1st, “Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, (*psuhe*).” By the body, (*soma*), all allow, is meant the fleshly part of man, which is here, and in other places, distinguished from his *psuhe, soul* or *life*. The persons who might kill the body were many, and are designated by the plural word *them*. The term here rendered *kill*, means *to slay, put to death*, as its scripture usage shows. It is here said men can kill the body—“but are not able to kill the soul.” What then is meant by the soul? Mr. Stuart, and others assert, it means an *immaterial, immortal soul*, which after death, is susceptible of happiness or misery in a disembodied state. But this must not be assumed. No proof is offered that this is true. That *psuhe*, here rendered *soul*, often means the *life*, is evident. It is rendered *life* in verse 39 of the context. But it may be objected, if soul only means here the *life*, is not it killed, when men kill the body? We answer no, for this is most expressly denied in the passage. They—“are not able to kill the soul.” In one sense they do kill it, namely; the soul or life. is no

longer in the body. But it is not *killed*, for at death the soul or spirit returns to God who gave it, Eccl. iii. 19—22. It returns to the fountain of life, and is to be restored to man, an immortal life, in the resurrection. After this, man shall not die any more, but shall be equal unto the angels which are in heaven. Until this period, man's life is hid with Christ in God. It is laid up for him, and will then be restored to him. So far as I can find from scripture, man is now *mortal*, but is to be constituted immortal in the resurrection. Indeed, if he was now immortal, neither God nor man could kill him, for can that which is *immortal die*? But we are told in the next part of the verse, that God is able to destroy both soul and body." This God can do, for if it pleased him he could blot man forever out of existence. It is added,

2d, "But rather fear him, who can destroy both soul and body in hell, (gehenna)." The word *him*, in this part of the passage, refers to some *one* individual, and is the contrast to the word *them*, in the first part of the verse. This is obvious. The question is, to what individual did our Lord refer? If it is said, it refers to *man*, the question returns—what man is meant? I also ask, how could this one man do, what more than one, are said in the former part of the verse, not to be able to do? If it is said, the civil magistrate is the man referred to, I then ask, could he kill the *soul* or *life*, which others could not do? Could he "destroy both *soul and body*?" If so, then God himself could do no more than this. But unless it can be shown, that destroying "both soul and body in Gehenna," was a punishment inflicted by the civil magistrate in our Lord's day, it is not at all probable our Lord referred to him. Besides, why should his disciples fear the civil magistrate in this case, yet are commanded not to fear them who kill the body. Were his disciples, to have no fear of others who killed them, yet were to fear the civil

magistrate, whose power could not go much beyond this? Perhaps it may be said,—according to Schleusner above, “any severe punishment, especially a shameful kind of death, was denominated Gehenna. This the civil magistrate could inflict on Christ’s disciples, and hence are here exhorted to fear him.” But if this was our Lord’s meaning, his disciples paid little regard to his words, as their future history shows. In the execution of their mission, they do not seem to have feared even the civil authority, so as to be deterred from their duty. See the whole book of the Acts of the Apostles.

Who then is referred to by the word *him*, whom the disciples were commanded to fear? God, we think is the being, and is designated by what He is able to do in the next words. He “is able to destroy both soul and body in hell, (Gehenna).” It will not I presume be questioned, that the terms rendered *kill* and *destroy*, are in this verse used as similar in import. As the word *kill*, cannot mean, merely to *hurt* or *punish* the *body* in the first clause of the first part of the verse, so neither can it mean to *hurt* or *punish* the *soul* in the second clause. And in the second part of the verse, the word *destroy*, is used as an equivalent to the word *kill* in the first; and what man in the first part is not able to do, God in the second is able to perform. God “is able to destroy both soul and body in hell, (Gehenna).” That the terms rendered *kill* and *destroy*, are used to express the same thing will appear from the following examination of them.

1st, Let us notice the word *apokteino* here rendered *kill*. Its general usage is, *to slay, kill, or put to death*. Mark iii: 4, is the only text where it is used to express the killing of the *soul* or *life*. “Is it lawful to do good on the sabbath days, or to do evil? To save life, (Pshen), or to kill, (apokteina).” But in the parallel text, Luke vi: 9, the word rendered *destroy*, is used to express the same idea. “Is it lawful on the sabbath days to

good, or to do evil? To save life, (*psuhen*), or to destroy (*apolesai*) it?" Let the reader notice, the same term *Psuhe*, *soul*, in the text in question, is in these texts rendered *life*, and it is said can be *killed* or destroyed. But can this *psuhe*, *soul*, mean an immortal soul? And can it be *killed* or destroyed? We should think not. No sacred writer mentions an *immortal soul*. Why then should it be contended that this is the sense of the passage before us. See Rom. vii: 11, Eph. ii: 16. 2 Cor. iii: 6, where *apokteina* is used, but which have no relation to our present subject. Let us now notice,

2d, The word *apollumi* here rendered *destroy*. This term we have just seen, is used by Luke in Chap. vi: 9, as equivalent to *apokteino*, *kill*, in Mark iii: 4; and both words, are in these texts applied to *killing* or *destroying* the *psuhe*, *soul*, or *life*. The term *apollumi* is also used in the following texts to express destroying the *psuhe*, *soul* or *life*. Math. x: 39—"He that findeth his life, (*psuhen*), shall lose (*apolesei*) it; and he that loseth, (*apolesas*), his life, (*psuhen*), shall find it." But must a man lose his *immortal soul* before he can find it? Again, Luke xvii: 38—"Whosoever shall seek to save his life, (*psuhen*), shall lose, (*apolesei*) it; and whosoever shall lose, (*apolese*), his life, shall preserve it." Is it then true, that the man who seeks to save his *immortal soul*, is sure to lose it; and he who shall lose it, is certain to save it. This is reversing, what is said about *immortal souls* and their salvation in the present day. But again, John xii: 25; "He that loveth his life, (*psuhen*), shall lose, (*apolesei*) it; and he that hateth his life, (*psuhen*), in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." If *psuhe*, *soul*, means an *immortal soul*, then the true way to secure its salvation, is not to love it, but to hate it in this world. Again Math. xvi. 25, 26, "for whosoever will save his life, (*psuhen*), shall lose, (*apolesei*) it; and whosoever will lose, (*apole-*

*sei*), his life, (*psuhen*) for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul, (*psuhen*).” See the same thing stated, Mark viii. 35—37. and in Luke ix. 24, 25, the same thing is also stated with this variation, “and lose, (*apolesas*), himself, or be cast away.” How cast away, it may be asked? I answer, just as the unbelieving Jews were, Rom. xi. 15, and Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 27. Again, Luke ix. 56—“for the Son of man is not come to destroy, (*apolesai*), men’s lives, (*psuhas*), but to save them.”

It is now obvious, that in a considerable number of texts, the *soul* or *life* is said to be destroyed. But who supposes, (unless grossly ignorant of the terms *psuhe* and *apollumi*, and still worse shutting his eyes to the context), that *soul* means any thing more than *life* or *person* in the texts which have just been quoted. Let *life* or *person*, be read instead of *soul* in them all, let their contexts be attended to, and no man can think an *immortal soul* is meant in any one of them. Or, let *immortal soul* be read instead of *life*, where the word is so rendered, and the absurdity of the supposition, that this was the the writers’ meaning, is at once manifest. In passing, I have merely hinted at some of these absurdities.

But, the question will probably be asked, why does Mathew in this text, make a distinction between *soul* and *body*, if *soul* does not mean an *immaterial immortal* soul? Attention to the following remarks, will place this subject in its true light. It is admitted by all, that in scripture style, a part is sometimes put for the whole, and sometimes the whole is put for a part, of the thing spoken about. Man, considered as a whole, is one individual person. But this person, is in scripture divided into three parts; *soma* body, *psuhe* soul, or *life*; and *pneuma* spirit. It is with the two first of these distinctions, we are principally concerned in the passage



before us. Notice then, that the *psuhe*, or *life*, is often put for the whole man, or person. So is its corresponding word *nephish* in the Old Testament. Take the following texts as examples, where *nephish* is rendered *soul*, and is used to express the whole man, or the person himself. Gen. xii. 13, xix, 20. Exod. xii. 16. Levit. v. 2, xx. 11. Numb. xi. 6, xxxi. 28. Take the following texts as a specimen, where *psuhe* is rendered *soul*, and is used to express the whole man, or the person himself. Acts. xxvii. 37. 1 Peter, iii. 20. Rom. xiii. 1. Acts. iii. 23. *Psuhe*, is also rendered *life*, and is used to express the whole man, or person. See Math. ii. 20. John x. 15, with other texts. Take now the following texts, as a specimen, where the *soma body*, and the *psuhe*, *soul* or *life* are both mentioned together, and distinguished from each other. Luke xii. 23. Math. vii. 25. Also Math. x. 28, the passage now before us. Such being the modes of speaking used in the scriptures, it is plain, if a writer only mentions the *psuhe*, *soul* or *life*, he designates the whole man or person, by putting a part for the whole. The same is the case, if he only mentions the *soma body*, or *pnewma spirit*. But sometimes, the sacred writers, designate the whole man or person, by enumerating all the three parts into which man is divided, body, soul, and spirit. See 1 Thess. v. 23. But to come more particularly to the passage in question. Sometimes the sacred writers, designate the whole man or person, by only enumerating two of the three parts, into which he is divided. This is evidently the case with Mathew, in the passage we are now considering. He says, God "is able to destroy both *soul* and *body* in hell, (*Gehenna*)." Or, he can destroy the whole man or person. That this is his meaning, is obvious from Chap. v. 29, 30, considered above, where he twice uses the expression, *thy whole body*, to express precisely the same thing. No man we think will dispute this.

It is obvious from this examination, that *soul* when used alone, designates the whole man, or the person himself. The *body* also when used alone, likewise designates the person, or whole man. And when *soul* and *body* are both mentioned, as in the passage in question, it designates no more but the man or person himself. Now, men who were able to kill the body, could not kill the whole man or person, for this would be to blot the man forever out of existence. God only was able to do this. He gave man life, it returns to him at death; and he has promised to restore it again, when this corruptible puts on incorruption. But on this view of the subject, there is no *immaterial, immortal* soul, which lives in a conscious state of happiness or misery, in a disembodied condition. This doctrine has been the fertile source of much error, and human misery. It also, makes void the doctrine of the resurrection. In confirmation of these remarks, it may be observed, that though the words of the New Testament are Greek, the idiom is Hebrew. Besides, it is thought, Mathew wrote his Gospel originally in Hebrew, which accounts for his using more of the Hebrew idiom, as noticed above, than Luke does Chap. xii. 4, 5, where the same discourse of our Lord is recorded. See on this passage below. With the above remarks and illustrations in view, we come to the principal question in discussion. It is the following.

What did our Lord mean by *Gehenna*? Whatever may be meant by "soul and body," or destroying them, it is very plain this destruction of them is said to be "*in hell* or *Gehenna*." This *hell* or *Gehenna*, Dr. Campbell, Mr. Stuart, and others, take for granted is a *place* of endless punishment in a future state. We shall here give a condensed view of our reasons, why we think this a mistake.

1st, Such a view of the term *Gehenna*, is contrary to its admitted original signification. It is a compound, *gia*

a *valley*, and *enn* the name of its owner, *Hinnom*. *The valley of Hinnom*. All admit this, as seen above.

2d, This sense given to Gehenna, is contrary to its usage in the Old Testament. Dr. Campbell frankly declares, it does not mean there, a place of endless punishment. No man will allege, it has such a sense in the Old Testament.

3d, Such a sense attached to the term Gehenna, is at variance with all the facts stated in the preceding section. If Gehenna means a place of endless misery, they ought all to agree with this sense of the word.

4th, This sense attached to the term Gehenna, is also at variance, with a large number of facts to be stated in the next section. If this was its true sense in the New Testament, they also ought to harmonize with it.

5th, In no instance, where Gehenna is used in the New Testament, is the writer speaking on the subject of a future state. The contexts of the texts where it occurs, give no countenance to such a sense attached to this word. But if this was its true sense, the context of some of them, would point out that this was its meaning. On the contrary.

6th, In the contexts of some of the passages where Gehenna occurs, the writers show clearly, that by Gehenna punishment, they referred to the punishment of God about to be inflicted on the Jewish nation. See particularly Math. xxiii. 33, considered below. No text or its context, are opposed to this sense of Gehenna, but are rather in favor of it, as seen from our examination of all the passages.

7th, Those who say, Gehenna in the New Testament, means a place of endless punishment, entirely assume this to be its true sense, without any authority from the Old. Their authority, for such a sense is Rabbinical writers; authority, which is rejected on other subjects, as of no value. Mr. Stuart, traces the origin of this sense given to Gehenna, to a superstitious notion among

the Jews, that demons dwelt in the valley of Hinnom. He would *smile* at least, if I traced my sense of Gehenna to such an origin. He does not pretend, that the sense he attaches to Gehenna, was of divine origin.

8th, Giving to Gehenna, the sense of a place of endless punishment in the New Testament, does not harmonize, with the phraseology used in the places where it occurs. Take for example the passage before us. Who believes the *whole body*, or *soul and body* are cast *into*, or are to be destroyed in a place of endless punishment? This is not done at death as facts show. And to say it shall be done at the resurrection is a gratuitous assertion, which is never asserted in the scriptures. See also on the passages considered above, and on Mark ix. 42—47 below.

Such are some of my reasons for thinking, Gehenna does not signify a place of endless punishment. They apply to all the texts, where this term is used in the New Testament. We have introduced them here, because this is considered the strongest text, to designate this place of misery. In view of these reasons, let us look for a moment at this passage. "But rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna." To say our Lord meant by *Gehenna* here, a place of endless punishment, and call on others to believe it, is 1st, calling on them to believe not only without evidence, but contrary to evidence. To believe this, is not only implicit faith, but a man must shut his eyes to evidence, before he can say he believes it.

2d, Those who believe, our Lord here taught that Gehenna means a place of endless punishment, seem to suppose, God cannot "destroy both soul and body," or a *person*, except in their hell. But, is not this a very silly supposition? Pray, what can prevent God from doing this any where? He certainly could do this in *Gehenna*, the *literal valley of Hinnom*, as the word signifies. And could he not do it also, by the punish-

ment which he brought on the Jewish nation, described by Jeremiah under the symbol of Gehenna? But I ask,

3d, How was our Lord's disciples likely to understand these words? If God had previously spoken of a place of endless punishment by the name Gehenna, we allow, in this sense our Lord's disciples might understand them. But even this would not be certain: for as the prophet Jeremiah, had also spoken of a temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation under the symbol of Gehenna, it might be doubtful, if the words did not refer to it. But, as God had never before spoken of *Gehenna*, as a place of endless punishment, or, our Lord explained it in this sense to the disciples, how could they possibly understand his words in the sense which is commonly given to them? They could be at no loss to understand his meaning, if Gehenna means the punishment of God on the nation of the Jews. This sense of the term Gehenna, they had learned from their own scriptures. No other Gehenna punishment was taught there. And no other sense, can be rationally and scripturally given to our Lord's words.

4th, The phraseology of the passage, when correctly understood, accords with the view I have given of Gehenna punishment. The phrase, "both soul and body," is a mere Hebrew idiom, to express the whole man or person, as we have shown above. Our Lord then warns his disciples of their danger, in being killed or destroyed, by the punishment to be inflicted on the Jewish nation; a punishment as we have seen, which Jeremiah predicted under the imagery of Gehenna. He does not say, "they could not escape this damnation of Gehenna," like the unbelieving Jews, Math. xxiii. 33. No. Here, and in other places, as we have seen, he showed his solicitude, that they might escape this punishment. To rouse them to watchfulness and obedience, he exhorts them to fear him, who is able, or has power, to bring such a punishment on them, as well as



the whole nation of the Jews. To affirm, because it is said, God "is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna," that he actually did it, is surely incorrect. It is contrary to the fact, whatever sense we give to Gehenna. If it means a place of endless misery, I ask, did God destroy both the souls and bodies of Christ's disciples there? Surely not. If it means the terrible punishment God brought on the Jewish nation, I ask, did God destroy them with it? No; for we shall see in the sequel, they did escape this punishment. It is a very false conclusion, to say—because God is *able* to do a thing, that it is actually done. It is said, Math. iii. 9, "God is *able* of the stones to raise up children to Abraham." But according to this reasoning, he has actually done this. No one however believes this true. It was sufficient to alarm the fears of the disciples, to say, God was able to inflict on them the same punishment as on the unbelieving Jews.

5th, If our Lord's words,—"*is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna,*" designated their punishment in a future world, his threatenings to his own disciples, were far worse than his threatenings to the unbelieving wicked Jews. On Math. xxiii. 33, below, the only place where he threatened them with Gehenna punishment, he only says to them—"how can ye escape the damnation of Gehenna." There, we shall show from the context, he meant by Gehenna, the punishment coming on the Jewish nation. But can any man think, our Lord only threatened the unbelieving Jews with a severe temporal punishment, and threatened his own disciples with endless torments in a future state? Who can believe, the disciples were nine times solemnly warned about hell, Gehenna, in the world to come, and the wicked Jews only once about hell, Gehenna, or temporal punishment in this world? If Gehenna had the same sense, when our Lord spoke about it to both, it is beyond all reasonable question, it merely

refers to the punishment of God on the Jewish nation. See on Math. xxiii. 33, below.

6th, If *Gehenna* refers to punishment in a future state, the passage in question, rather teaches the doctrine of annihilation than endless misery. If, to kill the body, is to put it out of all pain and even conscious existence; so, to destroy soul and body, or the whole man, must be to put them out of all pain and conscious existence. But did Christ threaten his own disciples with annihilation? And, was God to cast them into Gehenna in another world, to accomplish this? Excuse me from believing, he threatened them with either annihilation or endless misery, until the evidence I have produced is destroyed, and good evidence is adduced, to prove this is true.

We have said enough, and perhaps more than was necessary on this passage. We have discussed it repeatedly. See my answer to Mr. Sabine, Letters to Mr. Hudson, and, Reply to Professor Stuart. See also on Luke xii. 4, 5, below.

Math. xviii. 9. "And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell, (*Gehenna*) fire." Mr. Stuart considers this text, "an instance of the same nature, as Math. v. 29, 30, excepting, that the phrase here is *Gehenna tou puros*, a fiery *Gehenna*; which one cannot doubt has the same meaning as *unquenchable fire*, Mark ix. 43, 45, inasmuch as this very phrase is there used to explain *Gehenna*; the same meaning also as *the lake of fire*, Rev. xx. 14, 15; xxi. 8, which is 'the second death' Rev. xxi. 9." As to *the lake of fire*, which is the second death, meaning Mr. Stuart's hell, we think a great mistake. But, it would be too great a digression from our present subject, to examine this here. As the phrase *Gehenna tou puros*, a fiery *Gehenna*, is considered the same as *unquenchable fire*, Mark ix. 43—45, we refer the reader to our remarks on this passage be-

low. See on Math. v. 22, 29, 30, above, for an explanation of some things in this verse. There, we have seen what is meant by a hand or foot offending. Also, the *figurative* use of the term *fire* has been noticed; and on the texts already considered, we have seen, that *Gehenna*, and *casting into Gehenna*, does not refer to punishment in a future state, but to the infliction of punishment on the Jewish nation. On this text however with its context, we observe.

1st, Here, as in all the preceding texts, our Lord addressed his own disciples. It is also obvious from the context, he was not speaking to them on the subject of a future state. In no text where he speaks of *Gehenna*, was this the subject of his discourse, which circumstance, together with his disciples being chiefly addressed about *Gehenna*, show, it did not refer to punishment in a future world.

2d, The Greek phrase, "*Gehenna tou puros*," which Mr. Stuart renders, "*a fiery Gehenna*," instead of meaning, "the lake of fire," or *hell* in another world, he gives a better explanation of it in his essays p. 141. He says, in *Gehenna* or the valley of *Hinnom*—"Perpetual fires were kept up, in order to consume the offal which was deposited there. And as the same offal would breed worms, hence came the expression, 'where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.'" The allusion, is to the fire in the valley of *Hinnom*; and this only increases the strength of the figurative use of the term *fire*, in describing the terrible judgments of God on the nation of the Jews.

3d, In verse 8, it is said, "wherefore, if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire." It will be said, "is not *everlasting fire* in verse 8, the same as the fiery *Gehenna* verse 9? And to be cast into everlasting fire, the same as to be

cast into this fiery Gehenna? And is not this a strong objection to your views of Gehenna?" We admit all this; and to strengthen the objection, will add the following. The Greek phrase, *pur to aionion*, here rendered *everlasting fire*, is the same in Math. xxv. 41, and rendered by the same words. I also admit, both passages refer to the same punishment, and that what in these texts, is called *everlasting fire*, is called *everlasting punishment* verse 46. I have no occasion to dispute this. I admit also, that the same punishment is called, "the damnation of hell, or Gehenna," Math. xxiii. 33; "eternal damnation," Mark iii. 29; and is also designated, by other terrific expressions too tedious to detail. See my second Inquiry, on these and all the texts in the Bible, where *eternal*, *everlasting*, etc. occur. But so far from these admissions, being against my views of *Gehenna*, they strongly confirm them, as I shall now attempt to show. I observe then,

1st, That the phrases *Gehenna fire*, *everlasting fire*, *damnation of hell*, or *Gehenna*, and *eternal damnation*, were used by Jews, and addressed to Jews, who were familiar with the language of the Old Testament scriptures. Certainly our Lord was a Jew, and his disciples were Jews, whom in the passage before us, he addressed about *everlasting fire*, and *hell*, or *Gehenna fire*: or in plain words, *everlasting punishment*. No persons except Jews, were ever threatened with *Gehenna fire*, either by Christ or his apostles. Nothing is ever said to gentiles about *Gehenna*, as shown in another place. As it is then contended, *Gehenna fire* in verse 9, and *everlasting fire* in verse 8, express the same punishment, let us consider,

2d, If an *everlasting fire* or *punishment*, was threatened the Jews in their scriptures, and what that *fire* or *punishment* was. Was it in another world? When, and how did this punishment come upon them? These questions will be noticed in what follows. Our fear is,

we cannot spare room, to say all we wish to say on this subject, for it has an important bearing on the question before us about Gehenna. The first passage I produce in proof, that an *everlasting fire* or *punishment*, was threatened the Jews in their own scriptures, and was not in a future state, is,

Isai. xxxiii. 14. "The sinners in Zion are afraid, fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" This passage, has been often quoted to prove, the endless duration of future punishment. A great mistake, for 1st, It is manifest the *Jews*, and the *hypocritical wicked Jews*, are the persons designated in the passage. They are termed *sinners*, *sinners in Zion*, and *hypocrites*, which agrees with our Lord's words Math. 23, "woe unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites." Notice, what is called—"sinners in Zion," in the first part of the verse, answers, according to the Jewish parallelism, to "hypocrites" in the second; and their being "afraid" in the first, answers to "fearfulness" seizing them in the second. A doubt cannot be entertained, that the prophet speaks particularly of Jews, and of them only. The question is, did the prophet refer to the Jews in our Lord's day? The very language of the passage, seems to determine that he did. This is confirmed by the context, for the days of the gospel dispensation seem to be alluded to. For example verse 18, seems to be quoted by the apostle, 1 Cor. i. 20. The Roman people seems to be spoken of verse 19, who were to come against the Jews, and destroy their city and temple. And their condition at that period, seems to be described v. 11, 12. The Messiah and his times are alluded to verses 5, 6. The condition of our Lord's disciples, seems to be referred to verses 15—17. And from verse 20, to the end of the chapter, the peace and prosperity of the Christian Church, are described.



2d, Let us now notice the punishment of the Jews, described in this passage. It is not doubted, it speaks of punishment ; for it is alleged, it teaches *endless punishment*. This is drawn, we presume, 1st, From the words *fire* and *burnings*, occurring in the passage. But it has been shown in a preceding passage, that *fire* or *burning*, is a common figure to describe temporal punishment. Nor are we aware, that *fire* is ever used as a figure to designate punishment in another world. The expression here, is “*devouring fire*,” and the parallelism to it, is “*everlasting burnings*.” After examining the usage of the phrase, “*devouring fire*,” I cannot find it is ever employed to designate punishment in *hell*. But it is used to express temporal calamities. See two examples, in Isai. xxix. 6 ; xxx. 30.

2d, The word *everlasting* being here joined with *burnings*. But who does not know, that the word *everlasting* in the scriptures, often expresses a limited period of time ? Yea, who does not know, that it is even applied to punishment, when it does not express the *endless* duration of it. That it is so applied, to the temporal punishment of the Jews in this very passage, the above observations show. But if there should be any doubt in the reader’s mind about this passage, we introduce another, about which there cannot be any dispute. It is,

Jer. xxiii. 39, 40—“Therefore behold, I, even I, will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, and cast you out of my presence. And I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten.” On this passage, let it be noticed, 1st, the same Hebrew word *oulm* is here rendered *everlasting* and *perpetual*. The passage says—“I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and an everlasting shame, which shall not be forgotten.” It is well known *oulm* is rendered *perpetual*, *everlasting*, *eternal*, *forever*, and is often used to express a limited duration.

2d, Let it be noticed, the *Jews* are the persons of whom the prophet here speaks. He is speaking of them as a nation; and what the Lord should do towards them at some future period. It is not a narrative of what was already past, but a prediction of events, which were then future.

3d, Notice further, the passage predicts a *punishment* to the Jewish nation. God was utterly to forget and forsake them, and the city he gave to them and their fathers. He was also to cast them out of his presence, or out of Judea, where the Jews believed God's presence was, as could easily be shown. Moreover, he was to bring on them an everlasting reproach, and an everlasting shame, which should not be forgotten. This punishment of the Jews, could not be their seventy years captivity in Babylon. This does not answer to the strong language of the passage. Besides, the Babylonian captivity was just at hand, or, had already commenced, as the chronology shows.

The prediction, is concerning a punishment which was future, and of long duration. The language only answers in its full force, to God's punishment on the Jews at the destruction of their city and Temple, and their dispersion among all nations ever since. God seems *utterly* to have forsaken them, and the city he gave them. He has cast them out of his presence, and brought upon them an everlasting reproach, and an everlasting shame, which has lasted eighteen hundred years, and is not yet forgotten.

4th, But does any man think, do the Jews think, that the punishment here mentioned, is in another world, or is of endless duration? No; not an individual, will assert either of these things. The context, all the circumstances of the case show, the punishment is a national one, and is of a temporal nature. And if any one should ask, why this punishment of the Jews is called *perpetual*, *everlasting*, the answer is easy. All

know, *oulm* in the Hebrew, and *aion* and *aionion* in Greek, are used to express a limited duration ; and express a longer or shorter duration as the subjects to which they are applied require. See my second Inquiry, and reply to Professor Stuart's essays, where this subject is discussed. The present punishment of the Jewish nation, may well be called everlasting. It is the longest punishment they ever endured as a people. It has lasted already eighteen hundred years, and is a much longer everlasting, than some mentioned in the Bible, as could easily be shown. Their seventy years captivity in Babylon, nor no other punishment that I have observed, is ever called *everlasting*, like the one they are now suffering. But even their present punishment is to end, for the Lord is yet to have mercy on Israel. They, as a people, are beloved for the fathers' sake. It is then put out of all question, that the term *everlasting* is applied to temporal punishment, punishment which all admit is to end.

But let us suppose, the term *everlasting* was applied to punishment in a future state, this would not conclusively prove the punishment to be endless. Why? Because we find it applied to punishment in this world, which does end. It might be so also with its application to punishment in another world, for any thing I can find in the Bible to the contrary. But after very mature examination, I must say, I cannot find a single instance where everlasting is even applied to punishment in another world. It is chiefly, from overlooking the scripture usage of the words, rendered everlasting, etc. which leads people to conclude, that in the Bible, punishment is taught in a future world, and that it is endless in its duration. So far then from the phrase, "everlasting fire," in verse 8, being any objection to my views of *Gehenna* in verse 9, it strongly confirms them. *Gehenna* fire, and everlasting fire, in both verses, plainly refer, to the punishment which came on

the Jewish nation at the close of the Mosaic dispensation, and which is not yet ended. I think prejudice itself will allow this.

Math. xxiii. 15, "Woe unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites; for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him two-fold more the child of hell, (*Gehenna*), than yourselves." This is the first place in the New Testament, where any thing is said about *Gehenna* to wicked men. The scribes and pharisees were the persons addressed, as the passage states. Dr. Campbell says, this is one of the places where the term *Gehenna* is used figuratively. And Parkhurst remarks, that—"son of *Gehenna*, or hell, is one deserving of or liable to, hell." He considers, and justly, the expression an Hebraism. See Professor Stuart's letters to Dr. Millar, where this is shown at length. The words, plainly imply, that our Lord considered the persons addressed children of *hell* or *Gehenna*. This, according to Parkhurst, means "deserving of, or liable to hell, or *Gehenna*." Their making their proselyte, two-fold more the child of hell than themselves, of course means, they made him two-fold more deserving of or liable to hell, than themselves. The question then is, what *hell* or *Gehenna* were both deserving of, or liable to? If it is said, *eternal misery*; the sense evidently is, the Pharisees made their proselyte two-fold more deserving of or liable to eternal misery than themselves. But to assume this as the sense of *Gehenna*, is taking for granted the question in discussion. No proof of this is offered, no evidence of it can be given. Mr. Stuart, after quoting this passage, simply adds the following assertion. "i. e. he is doubly deserving of the punishment of hell. Surely the Savior does not mean to say, that he will suffer *double* the punishment *literally* to be inflicted on them, in the *literal* valley of Hinnom." But this assertion determines nothing. I might return it thus—"Surely the Savior does not mean to say, that

he will suffer *double* endless torments in Mr. Stuart's hell."

The simple question to be decided is—what was the sense our Lord attached to the word *Gehenna*? was it a place of endless punishment in a future state? Not a word in the context favors such an opinion, for our Lord was not discoursing on the subject of a future state, but on the judgments of God coming on the nation of the Jews, as we shall see from verse 33, to be considered immediately. If our Lord, in verse 33, by *Gehenna*, meant the temporal punishment of the Jewish nation, no one will allege, in verse 15, he meant by *Gehenna* endless punishment in the world to come. Indeed, this sense, would be contrary to its meaning in all the other passages, and no ingenuity could reconcile it, with the *facts* we have adduced, and still have to produce in the next section.

Math. xxiii. 33. "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell (*Gehenna*).” This is the only other text in the New Testament, where any thing is said about *Gehenna* to wicked men; and the solitary text, where the phrase, "*damnation of hell*" occurs. A very singular *fact*, if it means, endless misery in a future state. The only remark, which Mr. Stuart makes on this text, is—"does the Savior mean here to ask, how can ye escape being burned alive in the valley of Hinnom? Were they in danger of this?" We answer his question, very promptly and pleasantly, no. No; they were in no danger of this, for Mr. Stuart has shown, burning alive in the valley of Hinnom, was not a punishment inflicted in the days of our Lord, either by Jews or Romans. To balance this account with Mr. Stuart, I ask and in his own words—"does the Savior mean here to ask, 'How can ye escape being burned in hell the world of woe? Were they in any danger of this?'" Having balanced this short account, we may now inquire, what our Lord meant to teach in this passage? Let us



1st, Examine the import of the word *kriseos*, here rendered *damnation*. This word, means—*judgment* or *punishment*. Dr. Campbell and others render this word *punishment*. See his note in Math. xii. 40. It is so rendered in some places in our common version. But, as I have examined its scripture usage in my second inquiry, to it I refer the investigating reader for what I have advanced on the subject. It would be useless to discuss it here, as there is no dispute respecting the sense of the word in the passage in question. The sense, all admit is—"how can ye escape the *punishment* of *hell* or *Gehenna*." I may just notice, what must be obvious to every one, that the word *damnation*, or *punishment*, determines nothing about the *place*, the *nature*, or *duration* of the punishment alluded to. It expresses *punishment* to the persons addressed, but all these things must be determined from other sources of evidence, than the word here rendered *damnation*. But the word *damnation* in most people's ears, has a much more terrific sound, than either the word *judgment* or *punishment*. It carries their minds, into a future state for that damnation, or punishment. Let us inquire,

2d, What sense did our Lord attach to the term *Gehenna*? The correct understanding of the passage, depends on ascertaining this. If it means, as Mr. Stuart and others assert, the place of eternal misery to all the wicked, then, beyond all question, our Lord's meaning is—how can ye escape the punishment of endless misery? But this sense of the term must not be assumed; it must be established on scripture authority. How then, it will be asked, shall we determine, in what sense our Lord used the word *Gehenna* in this passage? I answer, there are three ways at least, in which this may be determined, for no scripture question can be determined without them. These are—*The original meaning of the term Gehenna*; *its scripture usage*; and *the context of the passages in question*. Let us notice,

1st, *The original meaning of the term Gehenna.* Did it originally mean *hell, world of woe, the place of torment reserved for the punishment of the wicked in a future state*, as Mr. Stuart and Dr. Campbell both assert? No; far from it, as their own testimony cited above shows. I need only very briefly advert to it here. What do they say, was the original meaning of the term Gehenna? Dr. Campbell says—"it is originally a compound of the two Hebrew words *ge Hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem of which we hear first in the book of Joshua xv. 8. ect. Mr. Stuart makes the same confession in his essays p. 140. On this point, there is not one dissenting voice I have ever heard, except Dr. Allen's. Speaking of Gehenna and its punishment, he says in his lecture on my first Inquiry, "indeed, the word seems to have been formed, and is used in scripture, for the express and sole purpose of denoting future punishment." Reader; cast the mantle of your charity, over this statement, made no doubt without consideration.

2d, *The scriptural usage of the term Gehenna.* Does Gehenna occur in the Old Testament, where it designates a place of future punishment for the wicked? No, says Dr. Campbell above; "In the Old Testament we do not find this place in the same manner mentioned. Accordingly the word *Gehenna* does not occur in the septuagint. It is not a Greek word and consequently not found in the Grecian classics." This statement we have examined section 1. We have also laid before the reader all the Texts in the Old Testament where the word Gehenna is found. Not in a single instance, has it the least allusion to a place of future punishment. We have seen, it is only used there in two senses. First for the *literal* valley of Hinnom. Second, as a *symbol*, or *source of imagery* to describe the temporal punishment God was to bring on the Jewish nation. In this last sense, we have shown, it is used in

the New Testament, in all the passages already considered. And those yet to be noticed we think strongly confirm all we have advanced respecting the sense given to this term. The passage before us, deserves particular attention. It is considered one of the strongest texts in proof, that *Gehenna* means a place of future punishment for the wicked; and yet, the context of this very passage, shows, that the sense I have attached to it, taken from Jeremiah, is the true one.

3d, *The context of the passage in question.* Does the context teach, that our Lord used the word *Gehenna*, to designate a place of endless torment, reserved for the punishment of the wicked in a future state? Let us examine and see. That our Lord, speaks on the subject of the destruction of Jerusalem, in this and the two following chapters, none we think will question. But let us examine the more immediate context of the passage? It is manifest from verse 1 of the chapter, that what is said in it was addressed to the *multitude* and to the *disciples*. From verse 2 to 13, our Lord spoke to his *disciples* concerning the scribes and Pharisees, and warned them against certain evils in those wicked men. At verse 13, he begins a direct address to the *scribes* and *pharisees*, and continues it to the end of the chapter. Some of them were present, for the discourse seems a very pointed address to them. No man can read from verse 13, to verse 32, without noticing, in what a plain and pointed manner our Lord exposed their wickedness and hypocrisy, and how often he said to them, “wo, or alas! unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites.” But at verse 32, he says to them—“fill ye up then the measure of your fathers.” The words in question immediately follow—“ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell, (*Gehenna*).” Two questions here, are presented for consideration.—*How were these men to fill up the measure of their fathers?* And—*what is the damnation of hell, which they could not escape?*

1st, Let us consider how these men were to fill up the measure of their fathers? If we consult the context, it gives us the following answer to this question. Verse 34, "wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets; and wise men, and scribes; and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city." That in this way, the scribes and pharisees were to fill up the measure of their fathers, no man will question. Their fathers had killed the prophets sent to them, verses 30, 31. And they were a generation of vipers, proving themselves to be the children of such fathers. The measure of their fathers they did fill up, by crucifying the Lord of glory, and persecuting his apostles and followers. See Acts 2d, where Peter charges them with this crime. Comp. John xvi. 1—3 1 Thess. ii. 16.

2d, Let us now examine, what the *damnation of Gehenna* was, which those men could not escape? If verse 34, answered the first question, verse 35, as certainly answers the second. It runs thus—"that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the Temple and the altar." When it is said here, "that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, all allow that punishment is meant. This, punishment coming on them was near, for our Lord added in the next words—"verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation."

The context then clearly decides, that our Lord, by the damnation of hell, referred to the punishment God was to bring on the Jewish nation during that generation. Indeed, if ever the context of a passage can decide, in what sense the writer uses a word or phrase, it is decided in the case before us. But is there a vestige of evidence in the context, which shows, that our Lord,

by the damnation of hell, meant a place of punishment reserved for the wicked in a future state? No, nothing which bears the most distant resemblance to this. Let any one attempt, to make out proof of this from the context, and nothing is so likely to convince him, that the interpretation I have given is correct. It was in making such an attempt, I was led to this very view of the words—*damnation of hell*. The only thing, which leads people to conclude, that these words refer to punishment after death, is the *false*, and *entirely gratuitous* sense affixed to the word *hell* or *Gehenna*. But all candid men will allow, that if we affix what sense we please to the words of the holy spirit, an end is put to all correct interpretation of the scriptures. To recur to the context, in ascertaining the sense of any word or phrase used by a writer, is allowed by all, a first rule in explaining his meaning.

But some things in the context, strongly confirm the sense given to the words—*damnation of hell*. 1st, the expression *damnation of hell*, or *Gehenna*, occurs in this discourse of our Lord's about the destruction of Jerusalem, but in no other discourse he ever delivered. Had he used it when preaching the gospel, when enforcing repentance on his hearers, or in speaking on the subject of a future state, one might be led to suppose, he did mean a place of punishment there. But, being used in such a discourse as this, and in no other, seems to put it out of all question, that I have rightly interpreted the words—"damnation of hell or *Gehenna*."

2d, The *persons* to whom the words damnation of hell were addressed, confirm my view of this passage, They were Jews, as all must allow. To no other person, is a word said about Gehenna, except them, in the whole Bible. Jews, and they only were concerned in the damnation of hell, for not a word, is said about Gehenna or its punishment, to any Gentile, whether a believer in Christ or an unbeliever.



3d, No man will dispute, that verse 35, refers to the punishment inflicted on the Jews at the destruction of their city and Temple, and more fully enlarged on Chap. 24th. Well, when our Lord said verse 36, "all these things shall come upon this generation," was not the damnation of hell, verse 33, and explained verse 35, the very thing or things referred to. And as the case of the Jews, was past all remedy, and could not escape the judgments of God which were impending over them, our Lord laments over their condition verses 37—39.

To the view I have given above, of the damnation of Hell, I am aware it is objected 1st, Prophecies have a double meaning; and though our Lord by the *damnation of hell*, referred to the temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation, in the same expression he might include, the endless punishment of the wicked in another world. Does not our Lord, Math. chap. 24th, blend in one description, the end of the Jewish state and the end of this material world? To this objection several answers might be given. 1st. If prophecies have a double meaning, why not twenty, or a hundred meanings? And if it is said, our Lord might include, both the above meanings in the phrase *damnation of hell*, let us see the proof of this supposition, from the context or some other quarter. What is it, which we may not suppose, and say, is taught in the bible, if never called on to establish our suppositions. But

2d, Giving prophecies, a double meaning, exposes the scriptures to ridicule, and is abandoned by all rational commentators. Mr. Stuart, in his letters to Dr. Channing, p. 126, gives up a double sense to Math. 24th. Commenting on verse 36, he says—"of that day and hour knoweth no man; no not the Angels, which are in heaven, neither the son but the father. The *day* and *hour*, according to some, is the day of Judgment; but as I apprehend, (from comparing the context) the day of vengeance to the Jews is meant." But, if he by

comparing the context, sets aside a double view of this text, comparing the context, sets aside a double view of the words damnation of Hell. It does more, it sets aside the common idea, that these words mean a place of endless misery to the wicked.

3d, Let it be noticed, the words—damnation of hell are not a prophesy. No; they are a very plain declaration put in the form of a question—"how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" But had they occurred in Math. 24th, and were a prophesy, we see from the quotation just made from Mr. Stuart, that only one sense could be attached to them, and the context must decide, yea has decided their true sense. Their sense is, "how can ye escape the impending vengeance coming on you nation." So long as an examination of the context, and scripture usage of words, are deemed safe rules in determining the sense of any scripture writer, so long shall we feel confident, that our Lord by the damnation of hell, did mean this, and had no reference to endless misery in another world.

4th, But this double view of the words, *damnation of hell*, does not deserve notice, for it is not only a mere assumption, but is assumed in face of evidence to the contrary. This evidence has been stated above. Here I add, since people take the liberty, to give a double sense to the words damnation of hell, why not use the same liberty, and give a double meaning to every phrase our Lord ever used? For example, with the same breath he said—"how can ye escape the damnation of of hell," and "all these things shall come upon this generation." But why not give a double meaning to the last words, and say, he meant also—all these things shall come upon this generation in *a future world*. And, all these things, shall come on the generation in which we live in the present day. Why not this, as well as that, the damnation of Gehenna shall come upon us?

It was shewn at some length, Sect 1, that Jeremiah

made *Gehenna* or *the valley of hinnom*, a source of imagery to describe the punishment God would bring on the Jews for their sins. Let the reader now take into view, what was there said, in connexion with the passage before us, and notice the following things. Jeremiah and our Lord, evidently addressed the same people, the Jews. Both speak of a punishment, a dreadful punishment to this people, and they speak of it, using the term *Gehennat* to describe it. Both speak of it as punishment in this world, without giving the least hint, that it extended to a future state of existence. Both confine this *Gehenna punishment* to the Jews, without intimating it belonged to the Gentile nations, or must be suffered by other wicked men. Jeremiah foretold, some hundred years before, a punishment to the Jews, to the fathers of the very men our Lord addressed. Our Lord points them to that prediction, and solemnly warns them, "all these things shall come upon this generation." But there are two things, which the reader ought distinctly to notice, in which Jeremiah's prophesy agrees with what our Lord says respecting *Gehenna*.

1st, The prediction of a punishment to the Jews, under the emblem of *Gehenna* was a *national one*; one in which all classes of the nation were to be involved. Such is exactly the punishment of which our Lord speaks in the passage in question, as we have seen from the context. This rationally accounts for the fact, why our Lord said so much to his own disciples about the punishment of *Gehenna*, and mentioned it only once to the unbelieving Jews. They could not escape the damnation of *Gehenna*, but his own disciples might; hence he shews his solicitude, in warning them respecting it, and instructing them how to escape the severity of the vengeance which came on the unbelieving part of the nation. On no other view of the term *Gehenna*, can it ever be rationally and scripturally accounted

for, why our Lord should say so much to the disciples, and so little to the unbelieving Jews, respecting the punishment of Gehenna.

2d, The *time* referred to by Jeremiah when his prediction should be fulfilled, and the *time* referred to by our Lord exactly agree. No year or date, is mentioned by either of them, but there is a fact or circumstance, which answers the same purpose. Jeremiah, in his prophecy quoted at length above, said chap. xix. 15, "thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Behold I will bring upon this City, and upon all her towns, *all the evil that I have pronounced against it.*" Notice now what our Lord says, Luke. xxi. 22, "For these be the days of vengeance, that *all things which are written may be fulfilled.*" Jeremiah could refer to no other period of time, nor to any other punishment of the Jews, except the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. All the evil the Lord had pronounced against it, did not come upon it, until this event took place.

I may just add—if by Gehenna punishment, our Lord did not refer to the punishment predicted by Jeremiah, in no other way did he remind the Jews, that such a punishment was threatened them. All allow, our Lord in Math. 23d and 24th chapters, and in other places, spoke of punishment coming on the Jewish nation. Is it then in the least probable, he should entirely overlook so plain and pointed a prediction, as that in Jeremiah. And if it is denied, that by the damnation of Gehenna, he did refer to the punishment predicted by Jeremiah; that he meant endless misery in a future world; how happened he to tell the Jews about this, in a discourse where he is certainly speaking of temporal punishment, yet never said a word about endless punishment in *Gehenna* on any other occasion. If really, the *damnation of Gehenna*, means *hell the world of woe*, why should he introduce it in such a discourse to the unbelieving Jews? why speak of it only *once* to

them? and why speak of it as a thing they could not escape. The great object of modern preachers, in warning people about hell, is, to tell them they can easily escape it, by obeying their directions. But our Lord, had no directions to give the unbelieving Jews, how they might escape the *damnation of Gehenna*. The cup of their iniquity was nearly filled up, and the wrath of God was coming upon them to the uttermost. Before I dismiss this passage, permit me to bring the prophesy of Jeremiah a little more into view in connection with it. See this prophesy considered above, chap. ii. sect. 1, which ought to be consulted and compared with the passage under consideration. On both, taken together, I submit the following remarks.

1st, Who does not see, that the prediction of Jeremiah and the discourse of our Lord, Matth. chaps. xxiii. and xxiv. speak of the same events? Comparing both with that part of Josephus' history of the siege of Jerusalem, we see both minutely and affecting-ly fulfilled.

2d, It could not appear strange to the Jews, that our Lord should speak to them of the damnation or punishment of Gehenna, for under this very emblem the prophet Jeremiah had foretold great and dreadful calamities to this people. With the prophet's language the ears of the Jews were familiar, so that they had no occasion to ask what he meant by the damnation of hell. Nor could they find fault with him, in calling to their remembrance, a punishment to which they were exposed, so long ago foretold, but which was now near, even at the doors. Indeed, nothing but blindness of mind could have prevented them from fearful anticipations of such dreadful calamities. Accordingly they asked no explanation, nor seemed surprised at our Lord's saying,—“how can ye escape the damnation of hell?” Is this likely to have been the case, if by this expression the Jews understood him to threaten them with eternal



misery in the world to come? No sentiment our Lord ever uttered, was more calculated to shock their feelings, and rouse their indignation against him. To understand our Lord in this sense, was entirely at variance with their pride, prejudices, and religious opinions; for the Jews had no idea that any of their nation should ever suffer eternal misery. See Whitby's note on Rom. ii.

3d, Let us for a moment suppose, that any of the declarations concerning Gehenna, in the New Testament, had occurred in the above prediction of Jeremiah. For example, let us take the words of our Lord before us,—“how can ye escape the damnation of hell? I ask any candid man, how the Jews would have understood these words, had they been uttered by the prophet, or how we would understand them? It will, I presume, be readily answered, that the prophet would be understood as threatening the temporal punishment which he had been predicting. Must the words *damnation of hell*, then, only mean temporal punishment, in the mouth of Jeremiah, but in our Lord's, eternal misery? If these words would have conveyed no such idea in the days of Jeremiah, why should they in the days of our Lord, and especially, as he not only seems to allude to Jeremiah's prophesy, but introduces them in a discourse to the same people, and in treating of the same temporal punishment? It will not be said, that our Lord was discoursing about a future state of existence, or even on a different subject from that of the prophet when he used this expression. No: the subjects are precisely the same, and the same people were addressed.

4th, I ask, was the expression, “damnation of hell,” understood when our Lord used it, or was it without any meaning? If the latter, then the idea of eternal misery is given up, at least from this expression. Besides, it is not very honorable to our Lord, to say he used this expression without any meaning. If the former is contended for, in what way was our Lord understood by his

hearers? Nothing is said in the Old Testament, intimating that Gehenna was to have a different meaning under the gospel dispensation. Nor, in the New Testament is any thing said, showing that Gehenna was used there in a different sense from that which it had in the Old. By whose authority, and upon what rational and Scriptural ground, do we then interpret Gehenna in the passage before us, so differently from its allowed sense in the Old Testament? Our Lord was a Jew, and he spoke to Jews, who had the Old Testament in their hands. Until it is proved to the contrary, we conclude, that the Jews must have understood our Lord, by Gehenna, as their Scriptures taught them. We think, all will allow that this is at least a rational conclusion. That it is a correct one, ought not to be denied, unless it is shown our Lord laid aside the sense in which Jeremiah had used the word Gehenna, and adopted a new sense on mere human authority. If our Lord did this as to the word Gehenna, we doubt if another instance of the kind can be produced from the New Testament. If it were proved that he did so, it follows, that instead of calling the attention of the Jews to the true sense of Scripture, he rather encouraged them in a sense put on Scripture words of men's own invention. We have seen that Dr. Campbell avers, that our Lord spoke to the Jews in the dialect of their own Scriptures, and used words to which their reading of the law and the prophets had accustomed them; and yet he contends for a sense given to Gehenna in the New Testament, which it never had either in the law or the prophets.

5th, If we are to be indebted to the writers of the Targums,\* how to understand the word Gehenna or hell, but few people could ever understand the New Testament on this subject. Is there one in a thousand who ever saw the Targums? and is there one in ten thousand who

\* See the argument, drawn from the Jewish Targums, in favor of Gehenna being the place of endless punishment, considered sect. v.

ever read them? But until we have learned from such writings the sense of the word Gehenna, we must either remain ignorant, or take this sense at second hand from others. But put the Bible into a man's hands, let him search it on this subject, and compare the New with the Old Testament, would he ever conclude that the New Testament sense of Gehenna was so different from that of the Old? No; he would soon perceive that there is an agreement, and a very striking agreement, between both Testaments in the sense and application of the word Gehenna. Scripture usage, and the context, safe rules in all other cases, would soon lead such a person to the same conclusion to which I have come, that our Lord by "the damnation of hell," did not mean punishment in a place of endless misery. But it seems these safe rules of interpretation, must all be laid aside, to sit down at the feet of the writers of the Targums, to learn the meaning of Gehenna. But it is well known, how little confidence most people place in those writings in other cases, though their authority is considered good by many in the one before us.

6th, That Gehenna was made an emblem of temporal punishment to the Jews, rests on divine authority. But, that it was made an emblem of eternal misery, rests merely on human authority. Let us state a case, where system and preconceived opinion being out of sight, we would give a just decision, which of these authorities ought to be preferred. Suppose this case then reversed. In the Old Testament, let us suppose the word Gehenna to mean the place of eternal punishment for all the wicked. That this was its allowed sense, by critics and commentators, and that it never, in a single instance, meant temporal punishment. Suppose further, that the term Gehenna occurred twelve times in the New Testament. That upon examining one of the texts in which it occurred, say the passage before us, it evidently had the same sense as in the Old Testament. That the text and

context clearly decided this to be its meaning. But a Universalist informs us from the Targums, that Gehenna, in the Old Testament, in process of time, came to be used as an emblem of temporal punishment, and at last came to be confined to it; and that this was always and indisputably its meaning in the New Testament. This he roundly asserts, without any attempt at proof on the subject.—I ask, what decision we would form in this case? Let candor decide, if we would not say that the doctrine of eternal punishment was put beyond all debate. And would not every man agree to condemn the Universalist? Happy, then, is the man who condemneth not himself in the thing which he alloweth. But what would be the decision in favor of eternal punishment, and against the Universalist, if upon examining all the other eleven places in the New Testament, it was found, that Gehenna had the same or a similar sense as it had in the Old Testament, and in the one in the New Testament where the context so clearly decided? The triumph of the doctrine of eternal misery would be complete.—We shall leave it for every man of candor, what to say, if it is proved, that all the remaining passages which speak of Gehenna corroborate the views I have advanced on the passage we have been considering. But all this is strongly confirmed by a number of facts, showing that no other sense could be rationally attached to the term Gehenna. We have adduced a few facts already, and have yet some more to produce, proving that Gehenna cannot mean a place of endless misery for the wicked, but that it referred to the temporal vengeance coming on the Jewish nation. We should like to see an equal number of such facts produced, showing that Gehenna does not mean this temporal vengeance but eternal misery, before we are condemned for refusing to believe that this is its meaning.

7th, Supposing that the term Gehenna, in this passage, was *equivocal*, as it certainly is not, still accord-

ing to Dr. Campbell, my interpretation of the passage is correct. In his third Dissertation, sect. xi. he says: "Nothing can be more pertinent, or better founded, than the remark of M. Le Clerc, that "a word which is equivocal by itself, is often so clearly limited to a particular signification by the strain of the discourse, as to leave no room for doubt." The strain of our Lord's discourse in this chapter, fixes the sense of Gehenna, to be what I have stated, so clearly and decisively, that no room is left for doubt. But let us hear Dr. Campbell further. In his ninth Dissertation, part i. sect. 13. he says,—“ When a word in a sentence of Holy Writ is susceptible of two interpretations, so that the sentence, whichever of the two ways the word be interpreted, conveys a distinct meaning suitable to the scope of the place ; and when one of these interpretations expresses the common import of the word in Holy Writ, and the other assigns it a meaning which it plainly has not in any other passage of Scripture, the rules of criticism manifestly require that we recur to the common acceptance of the term.” This is just what I have done with the term Gehenna, in the passage before us. I have given it a meaning, “suitable to the scope of the place.” The sense I have given it, also “expresses the common import of the word in Holy writ,” where it is used as an emblem of punishment in the Old Testament. We shall see that it agrees also with all the places where it occurs in the New. The interpretation commonly given to Gehenna, “assign it a meaning, which it plainly has not in any other passage of Scripture.” “The rules of criticism manifestly require” then, the interpretation which I have given this passage. The commonly received sense of this word, is therefore contrary to the rules of criticism, as declared by Dr. Campbell himself.

I am aware that I have dwelt longer on this passage



than was absolutely necessary. This I have done for several reasons. It is one of the principal texts, supposed to teach the doctrine of hell torments.—It is also the only text, where a punishment of Gehenna or hell, is threatened wicked men in the New Testament, whether Jew or Gentile. It is also a text, the context of which decides clearly, what our Lord meant by the punishment of Gehenna. It serves as a key to unlock the meaning of other places, where the circumstances in the context, may not so clearly determine the sense of Gehenna. If our Lord in this passage, did not mean by Gehenna a place of endless misery, there is no probability that in any other this was his meaning; for here he spoke to men, whom Josephus says, were the wickedest race of men that ever lived on the face of the earth. Since by the damnation of hell, he did not threaten them with eternal punishment it is not to be supposed that in any of the other texts he did this; for what is said in them is addressed to his disciples. It is not likely he used Gehenna to express both a place of temporal and eternal punishment; and it is less likely that he should threaten the unbelieving Jews with the former, and his own disciples with the latter.

Mark. ix. 43—49. “And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, (Gehenna), into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell (Gehenna) into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell (Gehenna), fire; where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched!! Concerning these verses,

Professor Stuart simply says—"The like cases with Math. v. 29 ; xviii. 9, and where in both instances, *to pur to asbeston*, unquenchable fire is added, in order to explain the tremendous nature of the Gehenna in question. "What then is the Gehenna in question?

This being the most terrific, and full description of *Gehenna fire*, given in the New Testament, we shall give it a careful consideration. It ought to settle the question, that *Gehenna* does not refer to a place of endless punishment in a future state. Let it then be observed, several things are mentioned in this passage, which have been noticed already. For example, we have seen what is meant by cutting off a right hand, or plucking out a right eye, and need not be here repeated. It has also been shown above, that the term *fire*, is a common figure in scripture to express punishment, and punishment in this world, inflicted on men for their sins. The question in dispute is, does *Gehenna fire*, in this and other texts, express punishment in a future state? We have also noticed above, the expression "to be cast into hell fire." In this passage, we have the expression "to go into hell" once, and, "to be cast into hell" twice, which express the same thing. Let us first notice the things which are contrasted in this passage.

1st, To "enter into life," or, "into the kingdom of God," is contrasted with "going into, or, being cast into hell or Gehenna." If it can be shown then, that to enter into life, or into the kingdom of God, does not mean to enter into heaven above, so to be cast into Gehenna, or to go into it, does not mean to go into, or be cast into hell beneath. If kingdom of God, or life, refers to the heavenly world, I am willing to admit, Gehenna refers to a *world of woe*. Congruity in the contrast demands this. But we are confident this never can be proved.

2d, Entering into life, or into the kingdom of God,

with the loss of a hand, a foot, or an eye, is contrasted with going into, or being cast into Gehenna, without the loss of any of these. But who ever speaks, of entering into the heavenly state with the loss of their bodily members? or, of sending sinners to hell with their members being mutilated? Let it be admitted, our Lord only meant, that his disciples, in order to enter into life, or the kingdom of God, must part with things as dear to them as a right hand or eye.—What then? This may suit the one side of the contrast, but it does not suit the other; for I ask, do those who go to hell, carry with them there, things the other parted with, in order to get to heaven? as this will not be pretended, something else than *heaven* and *hell*, must be meant by kingdom of God and Gehenna in this passage. What then is the true meaning of this language?

1st, In this passage, we have the phrase,—“to enter into life,” twice: and “to enter into the kingdom of God” once. Dr. Campbell, in his fifth dissertation, conclusively shows, that these two phrases, are used by the writers of the New Testament to express the same thing. This must be obvious enough, to any person who reads the four gospels with attention. But to enter into the kingdom of heaven, or kingdom of God, does not mean entering into heaven in a future state as many suppose, but entering into the reign or kingdom of the Messiah in this world. See the dissertation just referred to. John, Jesus, and his disciples, preached this kingdom as coming, as at hand. Christ’s reign or kingdom, did not, properly speaking, commence, until after his resurrection from the dead, when God exalted him to his right hand—saying, “sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool.” Indeed, in one sense, his kingdom did not come until the destruction of Jerusalem. Respecting this, Dr. Campbell in his note, on Math. xix. 28, says—“we are accustomed to apply the term *regeneration* solely to the con-

version of individuals; whereas its relation here is to the general state of things. As they were wont to denominate *the Creation Genesis*, a remarkable restoration or *renovation* of the face of things, was very suitably termed *palingenesia*. The return of the Israelites to their own land, after the Babylonish captivity, is so named by Josephus, the Jewish historian. What was said in verse 23. holds equally in regard to the promise we have here. The principal completion will be at the general resurrection, when there will be, in the most important sense, a *renovation* or *regeneration* of heaven and earth, when all things shall become new; yet in a subordinate sense, it may be said to have been accomplished, when God came to visit, in judgment, that guilty land; when the old dispensation was utterly abolished, and succeeded by the Christian dispensation, into which the Gentiles from every quarter, as well as Jews, were called and admitted."

It is very evident, our Lord did not think his kingdom had come during his lifetime. He said to his disciples Math. xviii. 3. "Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." It may be said—were not the disciples already in this kingdom? No; for our Lord's words plainly imply, that they were not; nor could they afterwards enter it, except they were converted. On this text Dr. Campbell says—"they must lay aside their ambition and worldly pursuits, before they be honored to be members, much more the ministers, of that new establishment or kingdom he was about to erect." See also Dr. Macknight who gives a similar view of it. It is evident, from Luke xxii. 18, and other texts, that our Lord's kingdom was not come just before his death. But the very passage in question, fairly implies, that in some sense, our Lord's disciples were not in his kingdom. If they were, why is it said to them—"it is better for

thee to *enter* halt into life," and, "it is better for thee to *enter* into the kingdom of God with one eye." etc. Those who wish to see further proof that the kingdom of heaven, or kingdom of God, was not come when our Lord spoke the passage in question, may consult Luke xxi. 31, 32. Mark ix. 1. Comp. Math. xvi. 28.

2d, We shall now examine, what our Lord meant by *Gehenna fire*, the contrast to *life*, and *kingdom of God*, in this passage. *Gehenna fire*, is here mentioned three times. What then did our Lord mean by it? our Lord explains what he meant thus "into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, nor the fire is not quenched." As *Gehenna fire* is three times mentioned, so the explanation is three times repeated. Mr. Stewart, p. 144, admits, that this is our Lord's explanation of *Gehenna fire*. All then we have got to do, is to ascertain correctly the true sense of this explanation. It divides itself into two parts which I shall now examine. Our Lord says,

1st, "*Into the fire that never shall be quenched.*" Do the scriptures then speak of "a fire that never shall be quenched," in a future state of existence? No. This I am confident is no where to be found in the Bible. But I find an "unquenchable fire," or, "a fire that never shall be quenched," often mentioned there. It is said in Math. iii. 12, "whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge the floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn the chaff with unquenchable fire." The same is repeated Luke iii. 17. *Fire*, we have seen on a former passage, is a figure for punishment. Jesus, was to separate the good from the bad of the Jewish nation; the former he should gather into his garner the church, but the latter, he should punish, or burn with unquenchable fire. This he did at the end of the age. Their *fire*, or *punishment*, is not yet ended.

But, let us now see, from whence the language is



borrowed, "A fire that never shall be quenched," or, an "unquenchable fire"! It is from the Old Testament. The reader may consult the following places, where a fire that shall not be quenched is mentioned. Amos v. 6. Isai. xxxiv. 10. and i. 31. Ezek. xx. 47, 48. But I quote the following passages, which are directly to our purpose 2. Kings xxii. 16, 17. "Thus saith the Lord God, behold I will bring evil upon this place, and upon the inhabitants thereof, even all the words of the book—which the king of Judah hath read: because they have forsaken me, and have burnt incense unto other Gods, that they might provoke me to anger with all the works of their hands; therefore my wrath shall be kindled against this place and shall not be quenched." The same is repeated, 2. Chron. xxxiv. 24, 25. Again, it is said, Jer. iv. 4. "Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your heart ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem; lest my fury come forth like fire and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings." Again, Jer. vii. 20. "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, behold, mine anger and my fury shall be poured out upon this place, upon man, and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruit of the ground; and it shall burn, and shall not be quenched." Again, Jer. xvii. 27. "But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the sabbath-day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the sabbath-day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched." Once more, it is said, Jer. xxi. 12. "O house of David, thus saith the Lord, execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench it." Such are the texts, which speak of an "*unquenchable fire*," or, "*a fire that never shall be quenched*;" and on which I shall make

the following remarks, in connection with the passage before us.

1st, God's wrath is said to be *kindled*, and shall not be *quenched*. So is his fury. It is said to "*burn and shall not be quenched*." God's wrath and fury, are compared to *fire*, for it is said—"lest my fury come forth like *fire*, and burn that none can quench it." But God has no such evil passions, as anger and fury; nor do these burn like literal fire. No, the above passages sufficiently explain what is meant by his anger and fury—namely, his judgments, or the punishments, he inflicts on men "because of the evil of their doings." Perhaps no figure could be more appropriate than *fire* to describe this. And a *Gehenna fire*, is peculiarly appropriate to describe God's judgments on the Jewish nation, for no *fire* was so terrible to Jews as the fires which had existed in the valley of Hinnom, whether we view them as used to consume the human sacrifices made there, to burn persons alive, or to consume the offal of the city of Jerusalem. As the punishment God inflicted on the Jewish nation, exceeded all the punishments which had ever been or will be inflicted on men, so no figurative use of the term *fire* could so well apply to it as the fire of Gehenna.

2d, Let it be specially noticed, all said in the above passages about an unquenchable fire," or, "a fire that never shall be quenched," was spoken concerning *the Jews as a nation*. The punishment thus described under the figure of fire, was to come on them for sins. Some of these sins are particularly specified, one of which is, they had—"burnt incense unto other Gods." It is called an unquenchable fire, not on account of its endless duration but its long continuance, as we shall see afterwards. No such unquenchable fire was threatened to the Gentiles. Jews, and the Jews as a nation, are the persons threatened with this punishment, which exactly agrees to what is said about Gehenna. Jews,

and Jews only, are threatened with Gehenna punishment in the New Testament.

3d, The anger, and wrath, and fury of the Lord, described in the above passages, under the figure of a "fire that should not be quenched," does not extend to another world. Nothing like this is intimated. On the contrary, it is particularly specified, in what God's anger, wrath, and fury consisted, and where the Jews were to suffer it. His anger and fury, was not to be poured out in *Hell*, but "*upon this place and upon the inhabitants thereof*," which was the land of Judea and Jerusalem. His anger, was to "*be poured out upon man and upon beast, and upon the trees of the field, and upon the fruit of the ground*." It was to be "*kindled in the gates of Jerusalem*," and was to "*devour the palaces of Jerusalem*," etc. If a single drop of God's wrath was to be poured out on the Jews in *Hell*, or in a future state, it is very strange the above passages say nothing about it. And, that the expression, "an unquenchable fire," does not mean endless in duration, is manifest, for this is spoken concerning the trees of the field, fruits of the ground, the gates and palaces of Jerusalem, as well as the Jews themselves. The dispersed condition of the Jews, and the waste condition of Judea and Jerusalem, afford a plain comment on the above passages.

2d, Our Lord still further explains what he meant by *Gehenna fire*, thus: "*where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched*." But where is the fire not quenched? The answer is—"where their worm dieth not." Where then is this? It is in *Gehenna* as the connection shows. But is this *Gehenna* in a future state? Let us hear Mr. Parkhurst about this. On the word *Gehenna* he says—"our Lord seems to allude to the worms, which continually preyed on the dead carcasses, that were cast out into the valley of Hinnom, *Gehennan*, and to the perpetual fire kept up

to consume them. Comp. Eccles. vii. 17, Judith xvi. 17. And see the learned Joseph Medes works fol. p. 31." Mr. Stuart says, in the valley of Hinnom, Gehenna—"perpetual fires were kept up, in order to consume the offal which was deposited there. And as the same offal would breed worms, hence came the expression, "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Here then is the place, "where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched," stated by Drs. Parkhurst and Stuart, both believers in endless misery. It is not in *hell*, *the world of woe*, but in the valley of Hinnom. Here there were worms; here there was a fire not quenched, by their own showing. But are these things in *hell*, their world of woe? It was long believed, hell is a place of literal fire, but now this is discarded by most intelligent men. The idea, of literal *worms* being in *hell* no one ever believed; hence the worm that never dies, is interpreted to mean *conscience*, which is to torment the damned forever. But this is a *private interpretation*, for *conscience*, is not spoken of under the figure of a *worm* by any sacred writer, either in this world or a future state of existence. There is nothing, in this passage or its context, which intimates, that our Lord was speaking on the subject of a future state, or that by Gehenna he referred to a place of endless punishment.

By what means then, shall we decide with certainty, what our Lord meant by the words, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched?" As this is his own explanation, of what he meant by *Gehenna*, it must be decided, by the sense of the passage, our Lord here quoted from the Old Testament. It is the following,

Isai, lxvi. 24. "And they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring

unto all flesh." Mr. Stuart, in his letters to Dr. Channing p. 69, makes the following remark, which well applies here. "It will be remembered that the passage in question is a quotation from the Old Testament; and that to quote the language of the Old Testament, therefore, in order to explain it, is peculiarly appropriate and necessary." Let us see, how peculiarly appropriate this passage from the Old Testament is, in explaining the words of our Lord before us.

1st, When Isaiah said—"for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched," did he mean to describe *hell, the world of woe*? No man we think will affirm this. But this must be affirmed, unless it is alleged, our Lord altered the sense of this passage in quoting it. Jesus gives no intimation, that these words spoken by Isaiah had one sense, and when quoted by him, another; that Isaiah only referred to temporal punishment, but he to endless hell torments.

2d, When the Jews read the words in the prophet, "for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched," if they did not understand them as describing *hell, the world of woe*, how could our Lord's disciples understand them so, when he quoted them? To say, these words when quoted by him, had such a sense affixed to them, and were so understood by the disciples, implicates both, in perverting the Old Testament scriptures.

3d, What then is the meaning of the words in Isaiah, "for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched?" Let it be noticed generally, the chapter in which this passage stands, relates to events under the gospel dispensation. The new heavens and new earth, mentioned verse 22, all allow, refer to this period; and the extension of the gospel to the gentiles, is repeatedly adverted to in the course of the chapter. With this in view, let us now notice what is said in the passage. It is said 1st, "*and they shall go forth and look upon the*



*carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me.*" The first question is, what men are referred to, who transgressed against the Lord? The context shows, they were the unbelieving wicked Jews. The next question is, what men are referred to, who should "go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men who had transgressed against the Lord?" The preceding verses show, that he refers to the persons who *worship* and *obey* the Lord. The third question is—to what place shall the men who worship and obey the Lord, "go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men who transgressed against the Lord?" The passage itself, answers, to the place where "their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." But are the *carcasses* of men who have transgressed against the Lord in *hell*, *the world of woe*? And who goes forth there to look on such carcasses? Who ever heard of *carcasses* in *hell*? And does any rational man think, persons go forth, either from heaven or this world, to look on them there? The idea is as absurd, as it is contrary to common opinion on the subject.

What then is meant? I answer, let the reader now recollect, what was shown from the Prophet Jeremiah above. The Lord was to make the city of Jerusalem as Tophet, and notice, he was to make the *carcasses* of the wicked Jews meat for the beasts of the earth, and they should bury in Tophet until there should be no place to bury. Above, Josephus the Jewish historian relates, that six hundred thousand of their *carcasses* were carried out of the city and left unburied. The disciples of our Lord, or those who worshipped and obeyed him, could not go forth into the very streets of Jerusalem, without looking on the carcasses of those men, for the streets were filled with their carcasses. And when the disciples left the city according to our Lord's directions, Math. 24. they must have looked on the carcasses of the men who had transgressed against the

Lord, if six hundred thousand of them lay unburied. They could not help looking at them, unless they were blindfolded.

But the passage adds—“*and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.*” This is said of the men who had transgressed against the Lord, mentioned in the former part of the passage. The Jews had greatly transgressed against the Lord; and filled up the cup of their iniquity; in crucifying the Lord of glory, and persecuting his disciples. They pleased not God, and were contrary to all men. The former part of the passage fully applies to them. Let us see how this last part applies; and they shall be an abhorring unto “*all flesh.*” Whoever will take the trouble, to examine the phrase, “*all flesh,*” easily found from a concordance, will see, it is used to designate the Gentile nations. In the unbelieving Jewish nation, who survived the destruction of their city and Temple by Titus, and in their posterity, this part of the passage has been literally fulfilled. From that day to this, the Jews have been an abhorring to all the gentile nations. They have been a by-word and a reproach, among all the nations of the earth. The Roman empire, at the time Jerusalem was destroyed, was considered, *the whole world*, and is so denominated in scripture. Titus’ army which besieged it, was made up of men from the various nations which composed this empire. The *carcasses* of the Jews, who had transgressed against the Lord, was an abhorring sight to Titus’ army as Josephus testifies. On this view of the words, they were literally and awfully fulfilled.

Let us now return to the passage in question. It is evident, our Lord quoted from Isaiah the words, and three times repeats them—“where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” If we ask—whose worm shalt not die? whose fire is not quenched? The answer to these questions must be drawn from verse 42. The persons who offended those who be-

lieved in Jesus, is the antecedent to the word *their*. Now, all allow the unbelieving Jews were, not only the greatest opposers of Jesus, but hated and persecuted such as believed on him. This exactly answers to the persons, Isaiah referred to in the words which our Lord quotes, and three times repeats. They were the men who transgressed against the Lord, or the unbelieving wicked Jews. Is it objected—"have you not said, our Lord in this passage was addressing his own disciples? We answer yes, but it is obvious enough, he does not refer to his own disciples by the word *their*, when he says, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." On the contrary, he is warning them against a punishment, others were to suffer which he describes by "*Gehenna fire, the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched,*" our Lord told his disciples, it was *better*, or *profitable* for them, to enter into *life*, into *the kingdom of God*, maimed in their bodily members than having all these to go or be cast into Gehenna or hell fire. And what he meant by this, we have seen from the above examination of the language of the passage.

Luke xii. 4, 5. "And I say unto you my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell, (Gehenna)." Here our Lord was also addressing his own disciples. It is, says Mr. Stuart—"a passage parallel with Math. x. 28 above, and of the same import." To my remarks there I then refer the reader. Some light may be shed on both passages, by comparing Matthew and Luke's account, of our Lord's discourse. Matthew says—"and fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Luke's statement of the same thing, is—"be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do." The words of Luke—

“after that have no more that they can do,” expresses, what Matthew meant by the words, “but are not able to kill the soul.”

2d, Matthew says—“But rather fear him, which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell (Gehenna).” To express the same thing, Luke says—“fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell, (Gehenna).” We notice the following agreement and difference, between Matthew and Luke in expressing the same thing. 1st, Both mention *Gehenna*, and no one can doubt, both mean the same thing by it. 2d, What Matthew expresses by the words—“*destroy in Gehenna*,” Luke expresses by the words—“cast into Gehenna.” But Matthew used the same language, “*cast into Gehenna*” twice, Chap. v. 29, 30. and in Chap. xviii. 9, once. To be *destroyed*, or to be cast into Gehenna then, mean the same thing with the same writer, and with both writers. But 3d, Matthew says “both soul and body,” God is able to destroy in Gehenna. But Luke mentions neither soul or body. The words—“After he hath killed,” used by Luke, or “after he hath killed, hath power to cast into Gehenna,” answer to the words of Matthew. They suggest the question—after he hath killed what? If we supply the answer to this question from Matthew’s account, it will be, after he hath killed or destroyed both soul and body, he hath power to cast into Gehenna. 4th, Matthew says God *is able* to do all this. Luke says, God has *power* to do it, which is the same thing. But it is rather a hasty conclusion, to say, because he is able, or hath power to do all this, it was done, as noticed on Math. x. 28. above. From this comparison of Matthew and Luke’s language, I would remark,

1st, Luke does not use the distinction made by Matthew between *soul* and *body*. He only mentions the *body*, in the first part of his statement, when he speaks of men killing it. In the last, when he speaks of God’s

killing, he does not mention soul or body. If he thought man had an *immortal soul*, and if by *soul* Matthew meant this, it was a great omission in Luke not to mention it, if God was to destroy, or kill the immortal soul as well as the body in Gehenna. But

2d, Luke's not using the distinction between *soul* and *body*, confirms what was noticed on Math. x. 28, that this distinction between soul and body, is a mere Hebrew idiom. It simply means, as noticed already, *the whole body, or the person*. That *soul* is used for the person himself we have seen above. But, that it is ever used to designate an *immortal soul*, in distinction from the body, and which is to be happy or miserable in a disembodied state, I am unable to find in scripture. This doctrine is assumed from this text, and Math. x. 28, but give no countenance to the opinion. Do these texts say the soul is immortal? No. Do they say the soul or body are alive in happiness or misery after being killed or destroyed in Gehenna? No. Not the slightest intimation of this.

3d, Both Matthew and Luke say, our Lord enjoined on his disciples not to fear men. Why? Because they could only put them to death. This they did, and was all they could do, See Acts xii. 1—3. The Apostles were above the fear of man, in fulfilling their mission, as the whole book of the Acts shows.

4th, Both Matthew and Luke say, our Lord enjoined on his disciples to fear God. This is often enjoined on Christians in scripture. Why on this occasion, did Jesus enjoin the fear of God on his disciples? Because though man could kill the body, none but God could bring upon them, that tremendous punishment predicted by Jeremiah under the emblem of Gehenna. This punishment was a much severer punishment, than that inflicted by men, who died without mercy under the law of Moses. The like had never been before, nor should its like ever be again. In this our Lord's disciples might



be involved, for nothing but fidelity to him and obedience to his instructions, could save them from it.

5th, Is it objected—"to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna, seems to intimate something more than this." But if it does, it intimates annihilation, or the total destruction of the whole man. But surely no one thinks, by destroying both soul and body in Gehenna, more can be meant, than—"the damnation of hell Gehenna" Math. xxiii. 33, which was threatened the unbelieving Jews. Did this mean annihilation; No. Did it mean endless punishment in a future state? No, for we have shewn from the context, it evidently meant the temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation. Who can suppose, our Lord threatened his own disciples, with a worse punishment than the unbelieving Jews?

James iii. 6, "and the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity: so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature; and it is set on fire of hell (Gehenna)." Dr. Campbell thinks, the term *Gehenna* is here used figuratively. He observes, it is—"the intention of the writer, to draw an illustration of the subject from that state of perfect wretchedness." But why forget, that before any illustration could be drawn from *Gehenna*, as a place of endless misery, by a Jew or any one else, it must first be known as a place of perfect wretchedness. But by Dr. Campbell's own showing, no Jew could learn this from the old Testament. The term *Gehenna* is not used in the old Testament to designate a place of endless punishment. Nor are the words *sheol* or *hades* used in this sense, as we have seen above. James, could not draw an illustration of any subject then, from such a place of future punishment, nor ought this to be asserted, until it is proved he knew of such a place, as a place of wretchedness.

James was a Jew, and wrote to believing Jews.

Now, no place to a Jew, conveyed an idea of more perfect wretchedness than the valley of Hinnom. Professor Stuart says—"we cannot wonder, then, at the severe terms in which the worship of Moloch is every where denounced in the scriptures. Nor can we wonder that the place itself should have been called Tophet, i. e. *abomination, detestation (from t up to vomit with loathing.)*" Such a place of perfect wretchedness was Gehenna, that he and others alledge, it was made a source of imagery to designate *hell* or *the world of woe*. Hence he says—"what could be a more appropriate term than this, when we consider the horrid cruelties and diabolical rites which had been there performed." Which then is most likely the truth? that James drew an illustration from hell in another world, a place unknown, or, from the valley of Hinnom, a place well known as a place of perfect wretchedness. He is here speaking of evils arising from an improper use of the tongue; and to draw an illustration from the valley of Hinnom, was both natural and proper, as it was the most abominable place known to Jews. Surely, it is as difficult to conceive, how the tongue could be set on fire from hell in another world, as from the valley of Hinnom in the present world.

We have now considered all the texts in the New Testament, which speak of *Gehenna punishment*. We have two or three additional remarks to make, on the whole of them. 1st, If these texts, do not refer to the same punishment, predicted by Jeremiah to the Jewish nation, then our Lord never reminded the Jews, that such a punishment had been threatened them. If he spoke of this punishment at all to them, he must speak of it under the imagery of Gehenna, for under this imagery it was described by the Prophet. It will not be pretended, that this punishment had been inflicted on the Jewish nation, previous to the days of our Lord. Fidelity to the unbelieving Jews, and love to his own

disciples, required he should frequently speak of it, for this punishment was nigh even at the door." The texts which speak of Gehenna punishment, agree to this view of the subject. Their contexts, the persons addressed about Gehenna, and the phraseology used, are all in unison with it. But, it requires the prejudice of education, that Gehenna means *hell, the world of woe*, and a great stretch of construction to make them apply to this view of Gehenna.

2d, It is asserted, Gehenna was such an abominable place, that in process of time, it was made an emblem of the endless punishment of the wicked in a future state. But if it was so abominable, as to be made an emblem of this, it ought to have been made so in the days of the Old Testament writers; for it was then the most cruel sacrifices were made in the valley of Hinnom, and the most horrid abominations were committed. After the Babylonian captivity, the Jews were cured of idolatry. But during the days of the prophets, no one ever thought, of making Gehenna, the valley of Hinnom, an emblem of hell, the world of woe. And yet, during this period, the prophet Jeremiah, did make Gehenna an emblem of temporal punishment to the Jewish nation. If Gehenna, in the days of its greatest abomination, was not made an emblem of the world of woe by inspired writers, but of temporal punishment to the Jews, why should it be made an emblem of this, when it was far less abominable, and that too by uninspired writers? If God did not see fit, to make it an emblem of hell, the world of woe, when at its height of abomination, who had a right on their own authority, to make it so afterwards?

3d, But it must first be proved, that God in the Old Testament had revealed such a *hell*, such a *world of woe*, before we ought to believe, Gehenna was made an emblem of it. I demand then that the texts be produced, which teaches such a world of woe. Where is

such a world described by the name Gehenna, or by any other name? I cannot find it. Mr. Stuart tried to find it under the name *Sheol*, but his attempt to establish this, was a total failure. I appeal then to every candid man, how could any Old Testament writer, make Gehenna an emblem of a world of woe, when no such world was known to him?

4th, The Jews in after ages, derived their notions of punishment in a world of woe from the heathen, and to this the term Gehenna was applied. But both the place, and the sense given to Gehenna, are of human invention. They are alike unknown in the Old Testament writings. Nor are they to be found in the New, when it is correctly understood. Let the reader judge, if the passages which speak of Gehenna, teach any such doctrine, for they have all been laid before him.

Such are all the texts in which the word Gehenna is used by the New Testament writers, and such are the remarks which have occurred to me in my examination of them. According to every just rule of Scripture interpretation I am acquainted with, I do not see how I could have interpreted them differently. Indeed, to me it is surprising, how the doctrine of eternal misery was ever founded on any of the texts which speak of Gehenna or hell. If I am correct, it also affords a striking example, how far we may be misled, in a proper understanding of the Scriptures, by attaching to a single word a sense different from that given it by the inspired writers. How far I am correct, my readers must judge for themselves. I hope they will, on the one hand, guard against receiving my error if it be one, and on the other, beware of rejecting my view, if true, from prejudices of *education*. Under the influence of these prejudices, I began to examine this subject, and have been obliged to relinquish my former views of Gehenna, from the force of the evidence I have already stated, and which I have yet to adduce on this subject.

If my views of Gehenna are found correct, it is also a striking proof, how far we may be misled, in a proper understanding of the New Testament, from our inattention to the Old. If the word Gehenna in the New, is used in a similar sense as in the Old Testament, all the false views we have had of the texts in which it occurs in the former, have arisen from our inattention to its usage in the latter.

Before closing this section, it is proper to notice any objections which have occurred against the *sense* given to Gehenna, in the passages we have been considering. 1st, One of the most popular objections likely to be urged, is, that the sense I have given to Gehenna is very contrary to the long established *ecclesiastical* use of this word. This is frankly admitted; but certainly this is no *certain* evidence that my views are incorrect. In the present case, I have done no more than what is done by Presbyterians, Hopkinsians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, yea, by all sects in religion. That the ecclesiastical use of some words is very different from the Scripture usage of them, few will deny. That they are different, and also how little we ought to regard the ecclesiastical use of words when contrary to Scripture usage of them, we here quote the authority of Dr. Campbell. He says, p. 416. of his dissertations,—“ecclesiastical use is no security that the word, though it be understood, conveys to us the same idea which the original term did to those to whom the gospels were first promulgated. In a former dissertation, the fullest evidence has been given, that in regard to several words, the meaning which has been long established by ecclesiastic use, is very different from that which they have in the writings of the New Testament.”

It is easily seen from this quotation, and more fully from the other dissertation to which he refers, that he did not scruple to disclaim the ecclesiastical use of words, if that use did not agree with New Testament usage.



We have examined the Scripture usage of the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus and Gehenna, and if ecclesiastical usage considers any of these words to mean a place of endless misery, we must say that it is not supported by the Bible. But of this our readers must judge. If it can be proved, that we have erred in the sense we have given to Gehenna or those other words, we shall be glad to see the error exposed.

2d, Another objection closely connected with the former, is, that my views of Gehenna are contrary to the opinions of almost all the learned in the present day; in ages past of the Christian Church; and to its sense in the Apocrypha and Jewish Targums. This may be true, yet my view of Gehenna be the correct and Scriptural one notwithstanding. Dr. Campbell, says, p. 91. of his dissertations,—“the opinion of Grotius and some learned Rabbis, unsupported by either argument or example, nay, in manifest contradiction to both, is here of no weight. Scriptural usage alone must decide the question. These commentators (with all deference to their erudition and abilities be it spoken) being comparatively modern, cannot be considered as ultimate judges in a question depending entirely on an ancient use, whereof all the evidences that were remaining in their time, remain still, and are as open to our examination, as they were to theirs. In other points where there may happen to be in Scripture an allusion to customs or ceremonies retained by the Jews, but unknown to us, the case is different. But nothing of this kind is pretended here.” We have attempted to decide the question, what is the meaning of the term Gehenna, by an appeal to the Scripture usage of this word, and we must say it is our present opinion, that it is not once used either in the Old or New Testament, to express a place of endless misery for the wicked.

We conclude this section with two brief quotations from Mr. Stuart, in his letters to Mr. (now Dr.) Chan

ning, which we wish were engraven on every man's heart, never to be effaced. In page 14. he says,—“the claims of the Bible to be authoritative being once admitted, the simple question in respect to it, is, what does it teach in regard to any particular passage; what idea did the original writer mean to convey? When this is ascertained by the legitimate rules of interpretation, it is authoritative. This is *orthodoxy* in the highest and best sense of the word; and every thing which is opposed to it, which modifies it, which fritters its meaning away, is *heterodoxy*, is *heresy*; to whatever name or party it is attached.” He adds, p. 109—“after all, it is a principle, by which, if I have any knowledge of my own heart, I desire forever to be guided, to ‘call no man master, on earth.’ I would place the decision of Scripture, fairly made out, IMMEASURABLY ABOVE all human opinions. I regard the one as the decision of an *unerring* God; the other as the opinions of *fallible* men.”

---

#### SECTION IV.

ADDITIONAL FACTS STATED, PROVING, THAT GEHENNA WAS NOT USED BY THE SACRED WRITERS TO EXPRESS A PLACE OF ENDLESS MISERY.

The facts which have been stated in section 2d, are certainly very singular, if it be true, that Gehenna in the New Testament signifies a place of endless misery for the wicked. Those I am now to adduce, are to me also strange, upon such a view of this subject. Some of them have been slightly hinted at in the course of our remarks, but deserve a more distinct statement.

1st, *If Gehenna means a place of endless misery for*

*the wicked, it is a fact that the apostles never preached it, either to Jews or Gentiles.* The history of the Acts of the Apostles, contains an account of their preaching for thirty years, but not once, is the subject of *Gehenna torments*, mentioned by them. They were commanded to preach the Gospel to every creature, and they did so, but to no creature under heaven, did they ever preach this doctrine. No living being did they ever threaten with such a punishment. They addressed the worst of characters, but to none of them did they say “how can ye escape the damnation of Gehenna, hell?” They did threaten men sometimes with punishment, but never with *eternal punishment in hell*. Saul said to Elymas, the sorcerer—“O! full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?” But does he threaten this man with the damnation of hell? No; he says, “and now behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season.” Acts xiii. 10, 11. In the same chapter, verses 40, 41. he says, “beware, therefore, lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets. Behold ye despisers, and wonder and perish.” In this last text the word *perish* occurs, and perhaps some may think that eternal punishment is included in it. But it should be observed, that Paul was here addressing himself to Jews, and concerning them our Lord had said—“except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish,” referring to the temporal destruction which was coming on the Jewish nation. I then ask, how this fact is to be rationally accounted for, if the apostles believed *hell* to be a place of endless misery? Can any man suppose they believed this, yet in the course of thirty years’ preaching, never mentioned it to their hearers? What would we say of a man in these days, who should preach thirty years, yet never

say a word about hell to those whom he addressed? Would we not say he was a Universalist? He would be an outlaw from orthodoxy. If my veracity in this statement is doubted by any persons, let them read the book of the Acts of the apostles. In the whole of it, whether they preached to Jews or Gentiles, you will find they are all alike silent on the subject of hell torments. If they believed such a doctrine, let others account for it, why they never preached it. If preachers *now* took the apostles as their models, we should hear no more about hell from them. We would then, respectfully ask, from what source did preachers learn that they should preach Gehenna or hell torments to us Gentiles? To what chapter or verse, in any book of the New Testament, can they refer us, where an inspired apostle ever did so? Let every one who preaches this doctrine, consider, if he did not learn it from his catechism, when a child; from books he has read; and from the preaching he has heard since he became a man, and not from his Bible? Let him also consider before he condemns my view, whether he has ever given this subject a thorough and impartial examination. We are all too prone to receive things in religion on such kind of authority, and too ready to condemn opinions contrary to our own, before we have duly considered the evidence brought in support of them.

To the above it may be objected—"Gehenna was a Jewish figurative mode of speaking of future eternal punishment, and had it been used by the apostles in preaching to the Gentiles, they could not have been understood; for the Gentiles knew nothing about Gehenna, as a place of future punishment." To this I reply.

1st, This objection would have some force, if it was found, that the apostles ever said to the wicked Gentiles, "how can ye escape the damnation of Hades, or Tartarus." Had they spoke thus, we might suppose, that

this was the reason they avoided the use of the term Gehenna. But do we find this to be the true state of the case? We certainly do not. No such conclusion then can be drawn, that the apostles said nothing to the Gentiles concerning Gehenna, because it was a Jewish figure which they could not understand. But,

2d, Admitting the term Gehenna, was a mode of speaking of eternal misery the Gentiles did not understand, they could have explained it to them, as they have done other things of seemingly less importance. Let any one read John's gospel, and he will see that he explains Jewish names, and customs; some examples of which we have given in another place. But,

3d, The above objection takes it for granted, that the Gentiles were unacquainted with the term Gehenna. But is there not as good reason to think, that the heathen in their intercourse with the Jews, should imbibe their notions of Gehenna, as that the Jews should imbibe the heathen notions concerning Hades or Tartarus. Their mutual intercourse would produce a mutual interchange of opinions. This being the case, if the spirit of God recognized either the Jewish notions of Gehenna, or the Pagan notions of Hades, as truth, we might expect that the apostles would have preached the doctrine to both Jews and Gentiles. Had both been recognized, we might expect Hades and Gehenna to be used indiscriminately by the apostles, in speaking of future eternal misery. But this was not done, if we may judge of their preaching from what is contained in the New Testament. If they believed both to be true they would have spoken at least of Gehenna to Jews, and of Hades to Gentiles, as a place of eternal punishment in a future state.

4th, But this objection takes it for granted, the Jews in our Lord's day, did use the term Gehenna to signify a place of endless misery, and that this was its *exclusive* sense. That this could not be its *exclusive sense*



we have proved ; for in reading the Old Testament Scriptures, they could not understand it so ; or, if they did, they must have perverted them to an extent I am unwilling to believe, even of the Jews. The objector must then prove, that the Jews in our Lord's day, did use the term Gehenna, exclusively to express a place of endless misery. The apostles did preach to the Jews as well as the Gentiles, but they did not even name it to them. Will any man affirm, then, that the apostles of our Lord understood him to mean, by Gehenna a place of endless misery, and yet never preached it, to either Jews or Gentiles, in the whole course of their ministry ? Whatever excuse we may make for them, in regard to the Gentiles not understanding the term Gehenna, none can be made for them on this ground respecting the Jews.

2d, *Another fact is, that the salvation revealed by the gospel, is never spoken of as a salvation from hell or endless misery. No such salvation was ever promised or predicted in the Old Testament, and no such salvation was ever preached by Christ or his apostles.* Our Lord received the name Jesus, because he should *save his people from their sins*. But I do not find he received this name or any other, because he should save them from *hell*. Our Lord and his apostles, in preaching, proposed by it to turn men from darkness to light ; from the power of satan unto God ; from idols to serve the living God ; from the course of this world ; and from all sin to holiness ; but where do we ever read of their saving them from hell ? No such salvation was preached by our Lord. In all the texts where he speaks of hell, he was not preaching the gospel, but addressing the Jews about the temporal calamities coming on them as a people. In no instance did he ever exhort men to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance, because they were exposed to hell torments in a future state. So far from this, in nine instances out of eleven, where

Gehenna is used by him, he was addressing his disciples. It is of no use to observe, that his apostles never made use of the punishment of hell to induce men to repentance, for they do not once name it in all their writings. James is the only exception, who mentions hell once, and that, only in a figurative sense. Nothing is said in our Lord's commission to his apostles about hell, and as little is said of it by them in their execution of it. To Jew and Gentile, bond and free, they are all silent about it. It is never mentioned by them to any persons, on any occasion, or in any connection, or on any subject. This silence of the apostles respecting hell, could not be because the people in those days were all so very good, that they did not need to be saved from hell. No; the whole world lay in wickedness around them, yet not a word is said about the torments of hell to alarm their fears, and to turn them from sin to God. No calculations were then made, as in our day, of the number who were daily and hourly going down to hell to suffer eternal misery. No; nor was such a variety of schemes adopted by the apostles, to raise funds to save men from hell. As they expressed no alarms about the vast crowds going to hell, so we do not find them expressing their joy because any were saved from it. They were deeply grieved to see men living in sin, and their spirit was stirred within them to see whole cities given to idolatry; but they never assert that all such were on the road to hell. They had great joy to see men walking in the truth, and often congratulated them on account of their being saved from their former course of life, but not a syllable escapes them, that such persons had been saved from endless misery. You search the Scriptures in vain, to find a single instance, where the apostles make any attempt to work on the fears and feelings of men by giving terrific descriptions of hell, or the horrors and howlings of the damned. As they never held up the torments of hell to make men

Christians, so we never find them using it as an argument to induce Christians to love and to good works. The latter are often reminded that they formerly were idolaters, working all uncleanness with greediness, to induce them to holiness ; but where do we find a word said of their being saved from hell, as any inducement to it?—In view of these things, how are we to account for them, if they believed hell to be a place of eternal torment for the wicked? Is it possible they believed this, yet preserved such a dead silence on the subject? This silence is an indisputable fact. To account for it, is above my comprehension.

Perhaps it may be said,—though none are said to be saved from hell, yet they are said to be delivered from the wrath to come, and to be saved from wrath through Jesus. All this is true ; but it is nowhere said, that this wrath to come was in a future state, or of eternal duration, which is the point to be proved to be conclusive on this subject. I think I can show that the expression, “wrath to come,” does not refer to a future state. To do it here, would be too great a digression from our present subject.

3d, *Supposing that Gehenna is a place of endless misery, who can vindicate the character of our Lord or his apostle's, for faithfulness, compassion, or zeal?* It is certain our Lord was faithful to him who appointed him. The apostles were also faithful, in declaring the whole counsel of God. But can all this be true, if they knew that this was a place of eternal misery, and that all the world stood exposed to it, yet said nothing to them about it? It is true, the Savior mentions Gehenna nine times to his disciples, and twice to the unbelieving Jews. But he nor his apostles, never use the word in speaking to the Gentiles. Now, I ask, is this like being faithful? Is this being half so faithful as most preachers are in our day? We think every candid man must say no ; it is rather being very unfaith-

ful, if they believed this doctrine as it is commonly received among us. Let it then be accounted for, how preaching hell as a place of endless misery now, is so much a duty, since it was not done by the apostles, nor even by our Lord himself. The fidelity of preachers in these days, both to God and the souls of men, in preaching the doctrine of endless misery in hell, far exceeds that of the apostles or of Christ, the Savior. *But how is their compassion to the souls of men to be vindicated, if by hell is meant a place of endless misery?* The case stands thus. The Savior, it is thought, knew *hell* to be a place of endless torment, but we have seen how he acted? He had compassion on the multitude, when they needed to be fed, and wrought a miracle to supply their wants. The compassion of his heart made him weep over Jerusalem, in anticipating the temporal calamities coming upon its inhabitants, and faithfully to warn them of their danger. In reference to those temporal calamities, he once said to the unbelieving Jews,—“how can ye escape the damnation of hell?” In reference to the same calamities, he uses the word *hell* in addressing his disciples. But he sheds no tears, he gives no warnings, he works no miracles to save, when it is said he knew *hell* to be a place of endless misery to all the wicked. But can any man think so of the Son of God, the Savior of the world? I ask; can any man believe, that he whose heart was wrung with anguish, at foreseeing temporal evils to be suffered by men, and who could shed tears at the grave of Lazarus, was so devoid of all compassion, as never to warn men of *endless misery in hell*? But *supposing* we should admit, that in all the places where our Lord mentions *hell*, such a place of misery is meant. In this case, our Lord indeed had a little compassion for the Jews. But neither he, nor his apostles, had any for the Gentiles. The apostles did shed tears, but not a tear falls from their eyes, on account of

men's being in danger of hell torments. On this subject their bowels of compassion were entirely shut up, for they say not a word about hell to any man.—Either then we must allow these men to be devoid of compassion, or admit that they did not know that hell was a place of eternal torment for the wicked. It is a plain case, that preachers in our day far exceed the Lord and his apostles in compassion for the souls of men. How solemnly, and seriously, and frequently, do we hear preachers warn men of hell torments? What deep compassion they pretend to feel for the multitudes of poor souls on the brink of hell, and going down to suffer its torments forever. In what loud and frightful tones, do we hear them describe the horrors of this place? Their compassionate hearts they describe as bleeding, because men will thus rush down to hell in crowds. But where do we find such things in our Lord's, or in his apostle's preaching? Were they to return to the earth, and preach just as they did, every pulpit would be shut against them, and they represented as unfaithful and unfeeling men. *But how is their zeal for the glory of God, and the salvation of men, to be vindicated, if they knew hell to be a place of endless misery?* Our Lord said, "the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up." But surely, it was not spent in preaching, and warning men against endless misery in hell. The apostles had also great zeal, and zeal according to knowledge, but they never spent any of it in preaching such a doctrine. The topic of hell torments, on which so much zeal is spent in the present day, is one which they never introduced to their hearers. This topic, hardly forgotten in a single discourse, and so powerful in inducing all classes of society to contribute money, seems to have been unknown in the days of the apostles. This theme, so effectual in rousing the sleeping energies of mankind, and of exhausting human ingenuity in devising means to save them from hell, was either unknown



to them, or they did not know how to avail themselves of it. It was never used by them to procure themselves a morsel of bread, or in any way to do good to others. The most profound silence is maintained by the apostles on this subject.

I do not blame the zeal of any in the present day, in urging the doctrine of hell torments on mankind. If the doctrine be true, I contend that their zeal is not ardent enough. So far from condemning the greatest zeal which can be manifested, I have some doubts, if a great many of such persons believe their own doctrine. If they did, how could they live in such wealth and splendor, yet do so little to save men from hell torments? I have serious doubts, if many of the preachers, most active and zealous in rousing the public to give money to save the heathen from hell, believe this doctrine. If they did believe it, would they live at home in comparative ease and affluence, and send raw, inexperienced youths abroad, to encounter the difficulties and dangers of such a work? No; they would rush into the hottest place of the battle, and suffer every privation in such a conflict. One thing is certain, that in saving others from hell, they seem determined to do it with as little self-denial and personal risk as possible. How often does it happen, that all the zeal for the doctrine of hell torments evaporates in the pulpit, and nothing more is heard of it until the preacher returns to it again. In the common intercourse of life, he speaks and acts to the same people, as if all his threatenings from the pulpit, of eternal torment in hell, were not true. Yea, some of the very persons whom he threatens with the torments of hell, are his most intimate companions through the week. He visits in their families, he feasts at their table, and his salary is chiefly paid by them; but not a word escapes him, perhaps the whole week, in warning them of their danger in being every moment exposed to endless misery. Can such a man be said, *truly* to believe this

doctrine? We must be allowed to doubt it, so long as such unfaithfulness is so apparent. I do not blame any for great zeal, if this doctrine be true. No; I only wish some one would account for it, if he can, why the apostles never mentioned hell as a place of torment, nor availed themselves of this doctrine, to stimulate their own zeal, or rouse that of others, in attempting to save men from such a punishment. I wish it to be accounted for, why this topic was never urged on Christians to induce liberality, to assist in saving the heathen from hell, or on the heathen to induce them to turn from their idols to the living God. I wish it to be accounted for, if the apostles knew of the doctrine of hell torments, why they *forgot* to mention it either to Jews or to Gentiles. Either they did not believe the doctrine, or, if they did, how is their fidelity, compassion, and zeal to be defended? Who would undertake to defend the fidelity, compassion, and zeal of any preacher in our day, who, if this doctrine was believed by him, should never mention Gehenna as a place of endless misery for all who died in ignorance and unbelief concerning the Savior? Instead of defending him, all sects, Herod and Pilate like, would be made friends to put such a preacher down by every means in their power.

4th, *The Old Testament is often quoted in the New, but it is an indisputable fact, that though quoted by our Lord when speaking about hell or Gehenna, it is not quoted to show that hell was a place of eternal misery, but in reference to temporal punishment.* Indeed, it was impossible for our Lord or his apostles to quote the Old Testament, to prove that hell was such a place of misery; for it is acknowledged by Dr. Campbell and others, that in this sense hell does not occur there. They could not make a quotation from it, for it did not afford them any thing to quote. Well, permit me to ask, why our Lord did quote the Old Testament, and quoted it in the very texts in which hell or Gehenna is

spoken of? In Mark ix. considered above, our Lord expressly quotes a passage from Isaiah, when speaking concerning hell to his disciples. In other places he seems to allude to others. Had our Lord then meant to use Gehenna in a different sense from that in the Old Testament, was it not calculated to mislead his hearers thus to quote it? Is it rational to suppose, that our Lord quoted texts from the Old Testament, which speak of a temporal punishment, when he intended that what he said about Gehenna or hell should be understood of eternal punishment? I think this would be imputing to our Lord a want of correctness of judgment, and even of common propriety, which we seldom have occasion to impute to our fellow men. The man would be looked on as insane, or something worse, who in the present day, if he intended to prove the doctrine of hell torments, should quote from the Old Testament the passage about the three children thrown into the fiery furnace. But this is just what our Lord did, if Gehenna in the New Testament means a place of eternal misery. See on Math. xxiii. 33. and Mark ix. 42. considered in the preceding section.

5th, *If there be a place of endless misery for the wicked, another remarkable fact is, that the Hebrew Greek, and English languages, originally had no name for this place?* We have seen from Dr. Campbell, that Gehenna does not occur in this sense in the Old Testament. Let us also see what he says about our English word *hell*. Speaking of *Hades*, in his 6th dissertation, he says:—"To this the word hell in its primitive signification perfectly corresponded. For, at first it denoted only what was secret or concealed. This word is found with little variation of form, and precisely in the same meaning, in all the Teutonic dialects. But though our word *hell* in its original signification, was more adapted to express the sense of Hades than of Gehenna, it is not so now. When we speak as Chris-

tians, we always express by it, the place of the punishment of the wicked after the general judgment, as opposed to heaven, the place of the reward of the righteous."—It is very evident from this, that the word hell did not originally signify a place of endless misery. In confirmation of what Dr. Campbell says, I shall quote the following from Parkhurst on the word Hades. He says,—“our *English* or rather Saxon word *hell*, in its original signification, (though it is now understood in a more limited sense) exactly answers to the word *Hades*, and denotes a *concealed* or unseen place; and this sense of the word is still retained in the *eastern*, and especially in the *western counties* of England; to *hele* over a thing is to cover it.”—The correctness of these statements are above suspicion; for, the fidelity of these men as writers, has led them to say things at variance with their professed creed as Christians. It is very evident, if they are to be believed, that our English word hell, did not originally signify a place of endless misery for the wicked, but like Hades or Sheol, signified the unseen or concealed place; and that it has this meaning in some of the counties in England to this day. It is then a very plain case, that for this place of endless misery the Hebrew, Greek, and English languages did not originally furnish a name. We have then to ask, had the inspired writers any idea of such a place of misery? If they had, it is evident they wanted a name to express it to others. If they have not expressed it by any word to others, how does any man know that they entertained such an idea? We have seen persons use words to which they had no distinct ideas. And we have also seen persons having ideas, which they could not very easily express in appropriate language to others. But we believe it is a singular case, that the Bible is said to reveal a place of endless misery, yet the inspired writers had no name for it. It is surely then a very proper question to be asked, who changed the

words *Gehenna* and *hell* from their original signification, to mean a place of endless misery? We shall see in the next section that the writers of the Targums and the Apocrypha, are appealed to, that this change was gradually produced, and finally *Gehenna* was used exclusively to mean such a place of misery. Who gave this new sense to the word *hell*, or whether its change of sense was gradual or sudden, I can afford no information. It is enough for us to know, that this was not its original signification; and this fact is attested by Dr. Campbell, Parkhurst and others, all firm believers in the doctrine of hell torments.

After these statements from such eminent critics, relative to *Gehenna* and our English word *hell*, it is very natural to put something like the following questions. 1st, Were these words changed from their original signification by divine authority, or was it on the authority of men? None of the above authors insinuate, that such a change in the meaning of these words was made by any of the inspired writers, or by God's authority. It has never been noticed in the course of our reading, that any one ventured to prove this or even asserted it. As to the word *Gehenna*, we have seen that Dr. Campbell says it came gradually to be used in this sense and at length came to be confined to it. 2d, By whom, and at what period of time, did this change in the sense of these two words take place? Here we are left to conjecture; for neither Dr. Campbell, nor any other writer, of which we have any knowledge, gives us any information about this. That a change in the sense of these two words has taken place, is certain, but when, or where, or by whom it was done, no information is afforded us. 3d, By what name was this place of endless misery called, before the Jews called it by the name *Gehenna*? And what was its name in the English, or rather Saxon language, before the word *hell* was changed from its original signification



and applied to it? Or was it without a name, before these words were altered in sense to suit it? 4th, If it had a name before Gehenna and hell were changed in sense, and applied to it, why was it laid aside? And what were the reasons which induced men to make such an alteration on their own authority? Why were they not content, to speak of this place as the Scriptures teach, if indeed they do reveal such a place of endless misery? 5th, If Gehenna and hell have undergone such a change of sense, on mere human authority, ought we not to change them again to their original signification, on the same authority?—Such are a few of the questions which may be put, relative to the change in the sense of these two words. We leave our readers to determine how they are to be answered. The last is easily answered, but all the others, we think must remain unanswered.

6th, *Another fact, deserving our consideration, is, that Christians, when they speak of hell, adopt the phraseology used about Sheol and Hades, rather than Gehenna, though it is contended Gehenna is the word which signifies the place of endless misery.* I shall explain what I mean. For example, it is evident from an inspection of the passages, in which Sheol, Hades and Gehenna occur, that Gehenna; for depth, is never contrasted with heaven for height, like Sheol and Hades. Nor, do we read of persons going down to Gehenna, of the depths of Gehenna, or of the lowest Gehenna. Neither do we read of the gates of Gehenna, nor of the pains of Gehenna. All these things are said of Sheol and Hades, as we have seen in a former part of this Inquiry. Besides, no representations are given of Gehenna, as of Sheol and Hades, that all the dead, or, even the wicked are there. No persons are ever represented as alive in Gehenna, as speaking out of Gehenna, or as tormented in its flames. It is never like Sheol and Hades, represented as a dark, concealed place,

under the earth. No: it is represented as on a level, with the persons addressed concerning it. All these, and other modes of speaking, are used about Sheol and Hades, but never in speaking of Gehenna; and show a remarkable difference in the Scripture representations of the two places. Such a marked, uniform difference must strike every man's mind with great force, who takes the trouble to examine this subject. In all the twelve places, in which Gehenna occurs in the New Testament, we have seen, that what I have stated is stricly correct. In them we read of the damnation of Gehenna or hell: persons are there said to be in danger of it; they are threatened with going into it, or being cast into it; but do we ever read of any person's being alive in it, and lifting up his eyes in the torments of this place? Now, comparing all these different forms of speech, about Sheol and Hades, with those of Gehenna, the difference is not only manifest, but very great.

Let us now compare these statements with the way in which Christians speak about *hell*, or the place of future punishment. It is evident, that they seldom, use the language employed in the Bible, about Gehenna, but that used in speaking of Sheol and Hades. Thus, for example, when a preacher describes hell to his hearers, and threatens the wicked with the punishment of it, he speaks of it as a deep place, as the lowest hell, and as a place to which they are going down; and speaks of some already there, lifting up their eyes in its torments. Permit me then to ask, why this is done? for what reason is the Scripture language about Gehenna laid aside, and that of Sheol and Hades substituted in its place; when it is allowed on all sides, that Sheol or Hades does not mean a place of endless misery? It must be confessed, that this is, at least, handling the word of God ignorantly, if not deceitfully; and under the mask of Scripture phraseology, imposing on the ignorance and credulity of mankind. If such

persons, will have *Gehenna* to be the place of *endless* misery, let them use the language of Scripture about it, and not use the language, allowed to have no reference to such a subject. We cannot help thinking, that the reason of this change of phraseology is from necessity. It would be contrary to fact, and even common belief, to speak to people of hell, in the language used about *Gehenna*. To tell them that their *whole body* should be cast into hell would not do. A case of this kind was never known. The change of the language, from *Gehenna* to that of *Sheol* and *Hades*, is therefore necessary, to be in unison with the common belief on this subject. If men were obliged to confine themselves to the language used in Scripture about *Gehenna*, when they speak of hell, it would probably lead them to see, that all was not correctly understood respecting it. I may add here, that this change of language, is not altogether in agreement with the popular ideas entertained of hell. The parable of the rich man and *Lazarus*, is not in unison with common belief. No man believes that the body is tormented, at least, till after the resurrection of the dead; but how often do preachers represent the body after death as in hell, lifting up its eyes there, and as tormented in its flames? But fondness for a popular sentiment, often blinds our eyes to the contradictions and absurdity of our language in speaking about it.

7th, *Another fact, deserving some notice is, that the punishment of Gehenna, is never once spoken of as a punishment for the spirit, separate from the body in an intermediate state, nor as a punishment for both body and spirit, after the resurrection of the dead.* As to the first part of this statement, let the texts in which *Gehenna* occurs, be ever so rigidly examined, they do not afford a particle of evidence, that *Gehenna* is an intermediate place of punishment for the spirit after the death of the body. The text, and we be-

lieve the only text, quoted to prove this intermediate place of punishment, is, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. But supposing this account to be literally understood, it should be remembered, that the rich man was not in Gehenna, but in Hades. Admitting then, that Hades is an intermediate place of punishment for the separate spirit, Gehenna must be given up as such a place. But ask any *common Christian*, who believes in the doctrine of eternal misery, if he thinks punishment before and after the resurrection, are in two different places; and he would stare at you as an heretic. He has always believed, as taught by his *parents*, his *catechism*, and his *sect*, that there is only *one hell* for all the wicked. It is high time that *common Christians*, in distinction from *learned Christians*, should be told that this is very far from being the true state of the case; as they would soon see, if the *learned* only spoke their minds freely on this subject. Dr. Campbell, has *dared* to speak of Gehenna and Hades as two places of punishment for the wicked, and it is somewhat surprising, that *orthodox Christians* have not before now, denounced him as an heretic.\*

But the punishment of hell or Gehenna, says Dr. Campbell and others, comes after the judgment, for Hades is to be destroyed. But let the texts which speak of Gehenna, be again examined, and as little is said about its being a place of punishment after the resurrection, as before it. No; we never find it once mentioned, in connection with the resurrection of the dead; but, always in connection with the temporal miseries coming on the Jews. Without making myself liable to the charge of arrogance, I think I may challenge the whole world to produce a single text, which speaks of Gehenna, either as an intermediate

\* Professor Stuart admits, *Sheol* or *Hades*, is not the place of *endless* punishment, but like Dr. Campbell contends for *Gehenna* being this place. He has two *hells*, like many others.

place of punishment for the spirit, or for both body and spirit after the resurrection of the dead. All the passages, we think, have been shown to have a totally different meaning, what has led people into such mistaken ideas on this subject, is, their confounding Sheol, Hades, and Gehenna together, as one place, and supposing that the word hell, by which all these words are translated, means the place of endless punishment for the wicked. The endless duration of this punishment has been believed from Mark ix. 43, 44. considered above, and from a few more passages, in which the word everlasting is used and applied to punishment.

It has been shown, from a consideration of the passages which speak of Gehenna, that it referred to the punishment of the Jews, and we think we have proved that this punishment was called an everlasting punishment. But where do we ever read of an everlasting punishment in hell, either in an intermediate state, or after the resurrection? Let something like proof of this be produced. It is very true, that we read in books, and hear in sermons, of an *eternal hell*, and of the howlings of the damned, and of infants a span long being in this place. But in the name of common humanity, and in vindication of the character of God, we demand in what part of the Bible such statements are to be found. Do the scriptures ever give such statements as these? They certainly do not. Is it not, then, daring presumption in any man to speak thus? Shall we never have done in attempting to supply what we deem God's defiances?

Dr. Campbell, and we presume all critics, object to the doctrine, that Hades is to be a place of punishment after the resurrection. It is evident from Scripture, that it is to be destroyed, and be no more. But why should this be objected to, and why should it be contended for, that Gehenna is to be a place of punishment after this period, and of eternal duration? Certainly as



little is said about Gehenna as about Hades, being a place of punishment after the resurrection. From no text in which Gehenna is mentioned, could this be inferred. Gehenna is never spoken of as a place of punishment after the resurrection of the dead; nor is it ever mentioned in connection with this subject.

8th, *Closely connected with the last fact, is another, that the learned seem to believe in two places of future punishment, and the common people only in one.* Dr. Campbell, we have seen, declares that Gehenna is the place of eternal punishment for all the wicked. He also thinks, that Hades is an intermediate place of punishment until the resurrection; but that this place is then to be destroyed. If it be true then, that Hades is one place of punishment, and Gehenna another, it is beyond all doubt that there are two places of future punishment, the one temporary, and the other to be eternal in its duration; the one before, and the other after the resurrection of the dead. The first, punishment for the soul, separate from the body, until the resurrection, and the other after, for both soul and body forever. This is indisputable, unless it can be proved, that Hades and Gehenna are only two names for the same place; or, which is much the same, that Hades is a part of Gehenna, or Gehenna a part of Hades. But no man who has paid the slightest attention to the passages in which these two words occur, can for a moment think so. So far from this, no two places could be more distinctly marked, as two separate places. The various modes of speaking about them clearly decide this, which we have noticed already. We think it has been shown that none of the passages which speak of Gehenna, support the idea, that this is a place of endless misery for the wicked. If such a place exist in the universe of God, and is revealed to us in the Bible, it must be under some other name than that of Gehenna. Neither Sheol nor Hades can be this place; for admit-

ting it to be a place of punishment in the intermediate state, it is to be destroyed, therefore can not be of endless duration. If such a place of misery is taught us under any other name in the Bible, I am willing to consider it. But this is not pretended, I believe, by the most zealous friends of the doctrine of endless misery.

The common opinion of the unlearned is, that there is but one place of future misery, and this place they call *hell*, whether this word be the translation of Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, or Gehenna. They always speak about it as one place of punishment, and consider this punishment as of *endless* duration. The same hell to which the spirits of the wicked are sent at death, is the hell to which they send all the wicked forever. If this be a mistaken notion of the vulgar, it is certain, most orthodox preachers do not attempt to correct it, for what they say about hell tends to confirm them in this opinion. They always speak about *one* hell as certainly as about one God; nor do they take any notice of the distinction so clearly marked in Scripture, between Hades and Gehenna.

9th, *Another fact is, we read of the sea, death, and Hades, delivering up the dead which are in them, yet we never read of Gehenna delivering up any thing dead or alive.* Now, let us suppose, that at death the body goes to Hades, the grave, or state of the dead, and the spirit goes to Gehenna or hell, to suffer punishment until the resurrection. If this commonly received doctrine be true, is it not as rational to think, that we should read in Scripture of Gehenna or hell delivering up the spirits of the wicked at the resurrection, as that Hades or the grave should deliver up their bodies. In order to a reunion at this period, it is just as necessary that the spirits should come forth from the one place, as their bodies from the other. But nothing like this is to be found in the Bible.

If heaven be, as is generally believed, the place of

happiness after death for the spirits of the righteous, and Gehenna or hell be the place of punishment for the spirits of the wicked, must not the spirits of the last, in order to a reunion with their bodies, come forth from hell as certainly as the first from heaven? But I do not find, that at this period a word is said about hell, or any spirits coming forth from it. But how is this accounted for, if the generally received doctrine be correct? The only possible way to account for this, is suggested by Dr. Campbell—that Gehenna is not the place of punishment for the wicked until after the resurrection. But this, we think, will not bear examination. In all the texts which speak about Gehenna, nothing is said of the resurrection of the dead. It will not be disputed, that when our Lord spoke to the unbelieving Jews, and to his disciples, of Gehenna, he was speaking on a very different subject, the temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation. Why introduce Gehenna on a subject like this, if it be true that the punishment of Gehenna, is that suffered by the wicked after the resurrection? If it is, why is it never introduced by the inspired writers, when speaking of the resurrection? It is natural to think, it would be always spoken of in connection with it. We find Hades follows death, and these two are spoken of as connected. But do we ever find it said that Gehenna follows the resurrection of the dead; or that there is any connection between these two things? No; this is not, in the most distant way, hinted at. Let any one read all the passages where this subject is treated of, and he will find that not a word is said by the sacred writers concerning Gehenna or hell. In 1 Cor. xv. the fullest account is given of the resurrection, of any place in the Bible; but neither the punishment of hell, nor any other punishment is spoken of in connection with it. We think it incumbent on those, who believe that the punishment of hell succeeds the resurrection of the

dead, to show, that the spirit of God speaks of it in such a connection. If what is said about this be true, this ought to be its uniform connection. But no man will assert that this is the case, who has paid any attention to the subject.

10th, *Another important fact, deserving our notice, is, that none of the original words translated in the common version, eternal, everlasting, and forever, are connected with Gehenna, or hell.* No; though we often hear preachers, in our day, speak of an eternal hell, such language never was used by any inspired writer. The phrase "everlasting fire," occurs in the Bible, and this has been shown, to be the same as "everlasting punishment," and the "fire that shall never be quenched." But we have seen, that none of these expressions refer to a place in a future state, called Gehenna, or hell; or that the punishment referred to is endless in its duration. But an *eternal hell* is often heard of, from the pulpit, and perhaps many believe it to be a Scripture expression. This, with many other terrific expressions, which are the chief ornaments of many modern sermons, and often uttered without much feeling by the preacher, are not found in the Bible. They are bugbears of his own creating, which no man who regards the Scriptures, and has considered this subject, will be frightened at. Children, ignorant, weak, nervous people, may, and indeed often are, powerfully wrought upon, by the terrific descriptions which are given of hell. And, after this is effected to a great extent, it is called a revival of religion. But is this the work of the Spirit of God? If it be, I demand that some part of the New Testament be produced, showing that similar revivals were effected by terrific descriptions of hell under the ministry of Christ or his apostles. Did they paint, in glowing colors, the horrors of the damned in hell to make men Christians? No man will say so. Not a word was

said by them about an eternal hell to the people. All such language is coined at the mint of modern divinity, and may be a very good plan for increasing a sect, but this is a very different thing from making men Christians. When many of these people get over their fright, they return like the dog to his vomit, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.

I am fully aware that to this it will be objected—is not everlasting life and everlasting punishment contrasted in Math. xxv. 46. and some other places? Yes, it is freely admitted, but this contrast is not between heaven as a place of eternal blessedness, and Gehenna as a place of endless punishment, as is generally believed.\*

11th, *In the common language of most Christians, you find heaven as the place of blessedness for the righteous, spoken of in contrast with Gehenna or hell, the place of endless misery for the wicked. Whatever they say about the former they have a counterpart in speaking of the latter.* I shall illustrate what I mean by an example or two. In the Bible we find persons expressing their hopes of going to heaven; but do we ever read of one expressing his fears of going to Gehenna or hell? We indeed find persons speaking familiarly of Sheol and Hades, and expressing both their fears and feelings in regard to this place; but do we ever read of one who expressed his fears or feelings about going to Gehenna? No: not an instance of this is found in Scripture. Again; we read of an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven; but do we ever read of endless punishment reserved for any one in hell or Gehenna? Nothing like this is mentioned by the sacred writers. Again; Paul, we are told, was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter: but do we read of any one

\* See this passage, and every other passage where everlasting, etc. occurs in the Bible, fully considered in my second Inquiry.



that was sent to Gehenna and there heard or saw any thing? No: but why is it not as natural to expect, that some one should be sent to hear the unutterable misery of the one place, as the unutterable blessedness of the other? The one, would only be a proper counterpart to the other. But again; we have some instances of persons mentioned in Scripture, who were taken up into heaven. Such were Enoch and Elijah. But do you ever find one individual, abandoned for wickedness, on whom God displayed his signal vengeance, by sending him bodily to hell or Gehenna? We indeed read of Korah and his company, who went down quick into the pit; but we have shown, that this pit was not Gehenna or hell, but only the grave or state of the dead. Again: Moses and Elias made their appearance on the mount at our Lord's transfiguration; but do we find any of the wicked characters mentioned in Scripture, ever making their appearance from hell? We have heard idle stories of wicked persons coming from hell to warn others, and describing the awful misery of that place. But is any thing like this stated in the Scriptures? All know that such ridiculous fables are not found there.

12th, *It is common with orthodox preachers, to represent hell as the place of endless torment for the wicked, and speak of persons being there tormented by the devil and his angels. Indeed, it is common to speak of devils and wicked men, as being in the same place of punishment.* But how they came by their information I know not. It is indisputable, that whatever the Scriptures mean by the devil and his angels, they are not once represented as in Hades, or tormenting any persons there. Even Dr. Campbell, though he considers Hades as an intermediate place of punishment, says—"That Gehenna is employed in the New Testament to denote the place of future punishment, prepared for the devil and his angels, is indisputable." See

the whole of this paragraph quoted above. If the devil and his angels are in this place, which Dr. Campbell says was prepared for them, they are not then in Hades, the intermediate place of punishment for the wicked. We ask then how it can be said with truth, that the devil and his angels are the tormentors of the wicked in Hades? But some have thought, that though Gehenna is the place prepared for the devil and his angels, they are not sent there, until the day of judgment, when they and all the wicked are to go there together, to suffer its punishment forever. If the devil and his angels are not in *Gehenna*, and are never said to be in *Hades*, it seems they, for the present, are not in either place of punishment, whilst wicked men are all sent to Hades to be punished from death until the resurrection. Besides, it is certain, that such preachers who represent the devil and his angels as the tormentors of wicked men in Hades, greatly misrepresent them, a thing which ought not to be done to *real devils*. But how often has it been heard from the pulpit and published to the world, that wicked men at death go to hell, to be the companions of *devils* and *damned spirits* forever. And has not *books* been put into the hands of *children*, describing in *words*, and representing to their eyes in *cuts*, the devil tossing about the wicked there with pitchforks? The truth is, whether my views of Gehenna be right or wrong, it is evident the common opinions entertained on the subject cannot all be true.

The evidence which has already been stated, proving that Gehenna does not signify a place of endless misery is sufficient. But there are yet some things, which ought not to be passed over, of a circumstantial nature, which very much confirm this evidence.

1st, Why did not John in his gospel mention Gehenna, and why did he omit all the discourses recorded by the other evangelists, in which our Lord spoke of Gehenna? It has been noticed already, that John wrote

his gospel for the use of the Gentiles. This is generally admitted. This being the case, it may be thought there was no occasion to say any thing about Gehenna to the Gentiles. If our Lord as I have stated, meant by Gehenna the temporal punishment coming on the Jews, this is readily admitted; but if the damnation of hell, was an eternal punishment for all the wicked, whether Jews or Gentiles, how could John omit all mention of it? How can it ever be rationally accounted for, that he believed the damnation of hell was an eternal punishment, yet say nothing about it to them? Was it a matter of more importance to tell them, that Messias being interpreted, signifies the Christ, or, that there was at Jerusalem a pool in the Hebrew language called Bethesda having five porches? Or that the water-pots, chap. ii. contained two or three firkins apiece? Can any man think, that if John believed Gehenna a place of endless misery, he would be silent about it, yet mention to his Gentile readers these things, comparatively of small importance? But why did John omit all these discourses in which our Lord spoke of Gehenna? A very good reason can be assigned for this, and it shows, in what light John viewed the discourses of our Lord, alluded to. It was after the destruction of Jerusalem he wrote his gospel. Whitby in his preface to the gospel of John thus writes: "The fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries do all agree, that he wrote it either in that Isle, (Patmos), or after his return from it; when he was *ninety years old*, saith Epiphanius; when he was an hundred, saith Chrysostom. So that according to the account of all these *ecclesiastical* writers, John must have writ this gospel a considerable time after the destruction of Jerusalem." Supposing then, that by the damnation of hell, our Lord referred to the temporal punishment coming on the Jews, we see a very good reason, why John says nothing about Gehenna, yea, omits all our Lord's discourses in which it is mentioned.

The event was past. To have related those discourses, would have been to deliver predictions after they were fulfilled, and warning men of evils to be endured, after they had been suffered. John's conduct is not only excusable, but highly proper, in saying nothing about Gehenna, and in omitting all these discourses. Does not this very omission strongly confirm the view which I have given of the passages, which speak of Gehenna?—And is not this omission, irreconcilable with the common ideas entertained on this subject?

2d, Why does not Luke mention Gehenna in his history of the Acts of the apostles? This is the more surprising, as he mentions it in his gospel. On my view of Gehenna, this can be rationally accounted for, but on the common view, is altogether unaccountable. In his gospel, he relates our Lord's discourses to the Jews, in which he spoke to them concerning Gehenna, in the punishment of which they were alone concerned. But in his history of the Acts of the apostles, he gives us an account of the preaching of the gospel, and its success among the Gentiles, who were not concerned in the punishment of Gehenna, and therefore had no need to have it mentioned to them. If my view of Gehenna be correct, we see that there was no occasion for him to say a word about it.—But if he believed, hell was a place of endless misery, on what grounds are we to account for his entire silence on this subject? If it was a punishment in common, to Jews and Gentiles, who died wicked, let it be satisfactorily accounted for, why the apostles did not preach it to the Gentile nations? If they ever preached this doctrine, it is certain Luke omits all mention of it in his history. To say they did preach it, is only a gratuitous assertion, and in fact impeaches Luke as a faithful historian. What historian, would omit mentioning the doctrine of universal salvation as preached by the Universalists, if he undertook to write the history of their preaching for thirty years?

But if it was right in the apostles, to say not hinging their preaching of Gehenna or hell, it must be right in us, for certainly they are the best models to copy after. Supposing then, that all the preachers among the Gentile nations, should, in imitation of the apostles, say nothing about hell to their hearers, who could blame them? They could urge the example of the apostles in their defence. Here they might take their stand, and bid defiance to the whole world to prove the contrary.

3d, Why did the apostles, never mention any thing about hell in any of their epistles to the churches? Not one of them, James excepted, ever introduces it. The reason of this is equally obvious. The epistles, for the most part, were written to Gentile believers, who were not concerned in the punishment of hell or Gehenna. James wrote to believing Jews, and we have seen, that he once, used this word. Now, can any one suppose, that if the Gentiles, had been exposed to hell or endless punishment, that the apostles never would, in any of their epistles, have reminded those to whom they wrote, that they had been saved from it? They are often reminded they were idolaters, and wicked, before they believed the gospel, and had been saved from such things: but not a word is said, intimating that any of them had ever been saved from Gehenna or hell. From the consideration of their being saved, they are often exhorted to love and good works; but never from the consideration of their being saved from hell or endless misery. As it is never said, that they were *once exposed to such a punishment*, so they are never reminded that they were now *delivered from it*. No self-complaisant remarks are ever made, that they were now safe from the torments of hell, nor any whining complaints, that their *friends*, and *neighbors*, yea, the whole *unbelieving Gentile world*, were every moment exposed to this punishment. We find the apostles and primitive Christians, expressing the most heart-felt grat-



itude, that they had been saved from this present evil world; that they were translated from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear son; and using all proper means that their fellow men might believe the gospel, and enjoy like blessings. The New Testament abounds with evidence of this. But do we ever find them saying that they had been saved from hell or Gehenna? Or intimating that their exertions in diffusing the gospel, was for the purpose of saving the heathen from the everlasting torments of this place? We leave it with every candid man to say, if the apostles and first Christians believed as people do now about hell, if they could have been thus silent on such a deeply interesting subject.

Further: no instance is left on record, where an unbeliever or a backslider was told, as now they frequently are, that they had sinned away their day of grace, and that everlasting torments in hell would be their unavoidable fate. No: nor is an instance or any thing like it recorded, of a person being driven to distraction, from anticipation of the horrors of hell, produced by apostolic preaching. No example is given in Scripture, of a person ending his days by suicide, to get rid of his present terrors of hell torments. Some instances of suicide are recorded: see the cases of Ahithopel, Judas, &c. But do we find a single hint dropped, that it was the terror of hell torments drove them to this? Even of Judas, it is not said that he went to hell; which ought to teach some persons modesty and caution, who, in the heat of their zeal, affirm that he did go to this place of punishment. If such persons had the Bible to make, they would express many things otherwise than it has pleased God to do, in the revelation of his will to mankind.

It will be allowed, that from the gospel of John, the Acts of the apostles, and the epistles, we learn what were the doctrines taught to the Gentiles. But can we

learn from them, that the doctrine of eternal punishment in hell, was one of these doctrines? Certainly we can not. Supposing, that such writings were published in our day, omitting all mention of hell or its endless punishment, would we not say that they did not teach the doctrine of hell torments? we have not stated this as an argument conclusive in itself. But we think, that if none of the other New Testament writers teach this doctrine, the argument is conclusive. We have seen, it is a conceded point, that Gehenna does not occur in the Old Testament in the sense of a place of eternal misery. If, then, none of the New Testament writers teach it, is not their silence proof, that no such doctrine was known or taught by them? It is well known, that the silence of Scripture about any doctrine, in other cases, is deemed a conclusive argument against it. And why not in the case before us? It would be dangerous to admit the contrary. If it was admitted, then no fault could be found with the doctrine of purgatory, and many other things about which the Bible is silent.

We often come to learn, what doctrines are held by persons, from the accusations of their enemies. Should we bring the doctrine before us to this test, we find some additional confirmation, that endless misery in hell was not taught by our Lord, or his apostles.

1st, Let us inquire what accusations the Jews brought against the Savior? The Jews accused him of many things; such as his being an enemy to Cæsar; as in league with Beelzebub; and as a blasphemer. On his trial, Pilate said to him, "behold how many things they witness against thee." The principal of these were, that he called himself the Son of God, and said he was able to destroy their temple. But I ask, did the Jews on any occasion, ever accuse him of having threatened them with endless misery in hell? No: bad as the Jews were, they never accused him of any such thing. If he ever had done it, would they have failed to bring

this forward against him? None of the Jews, had any idea of going to hell. Would they, then, have endured to be told so, without a murmur or complaint against him? Would this have formed no ground of accusation? No man can believe this, who has read the four gospels, and has noticed the unwearied opposition of the Jews to the Savior.

2d, Let us see what accusations were brought against his followers. They also were accused of being enemies to Cæsar. But passing over other accusations, we shall fix on what Stephen was accused of, as a fair specimen of what they were all charged with.—“This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law: for we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us.” Enemies, as the Jews were to the disciples of our Lord, did they even so much as insinuate the charge against them, that they ever threatened Jews with endless torments in hell? They say, that Stephen said—“Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place,” but did they ever say, that either Jesus, or Stephen said, that he would destroy them with everlasting misery in Gehenna or hell? No: let me advocate for once the cause of the Jews, they never brought such a charge against Christ or any of his followers. On this occasion, let it be remembered, that the accusers of Stephen were false witnesses, procured for the very purpose of finding him guilty. Now, does any man think, or can he suppose, that these false witnesses after saying Stephen said,—“This Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place,” would have forgotten to add, such an important charge, “And he also said, that he would destroy us and all the wicked in hell to endless duration?” The man who can believe this to be a mere oversight in these witnesses, in not mentioning such a material charge against Stephen, is prepared to believe any thing. But they could not

bring such an accusation against him, or any of the first preachers, for none of them ever used the word Gehenna or hell, in preaching either to Jews or Gentiles. All who had ever heard them preach, could have been called as witnesses to prove, that it was a false accusation. Such a false charge, would have been in face of public opinion to the contrary.

But let us see what were the accusations which the Gentiles brought against the followers of Christ. They accused them of turning the world upside down; of turning away much people, saying that "they were no gods which were made with hands." In consequence of this they were accounted Atheists, enemies to the gods, and deserving to be abhorred of men. Now, give me leave to ask, was the charge ever brought against them in any shape, by any person, that they threatened men with endless punishment in hell or Gehenna? No: all the jesuitical ingenuity in the world, cannot find a word said, which has such an appearance. Had the apostles then ever threatened the Gentiles with endless punishment in hell, would they have failed to bring this as an accusation against them? Should it be objected here, "have you not shown above, that the heathen nations all believed in the doctrine of future punishment, and that the Jews learned this doctrine from their intercourse with them; how then could the heathen be offended with the apostles for teaching one of the tenets of their religion?" To this I answer, that the heathen believed in a future punishment in *Hades*, but observe that the apostles neither taught such a punishment in *Hades*, nor in *Gehenna*. This is a fact we think beyond all fair discussion. Not a word was said by the apostles to the heathen, about punishment in either of these places. If they had preached future punishment in Gehenna to them, they might have said, we have heard of future punishment in *Hades*, but why preach this new doctrine, a

*punishment in Gehenna?* Their not preaching a punishment in Hades, shows that they did not believe this heathen notion; and the Gentiles never accusing the apostles of threatening them with endless punishment in Gehenna, is a confirmation that no such doctrine was taught to the heathen world.

Another circumstance, corroborative of the views I have advanced concerning Gehenna, is the following. On my views of Gehenna, the conduct of our Lord and his apostles, is just what might be expected, but if by Gehenna is understood a place of endless misery, it is strange and unaccountable. What I refer to will be best seen by,

1st, Considering our Lord's conduct. We have seen from a consideration of all the passages in which he speaks of Gehenna, that nine times out of twelve, all he says concerning it, was addressed to his disciples. In only one instance did he ever say to the unbelieving Jews—"how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Matth. xxiii. 33. Now, notice, that at verses 38, 39, he adds, "behold your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." After this, he never said a word to them about the damnation of hell. Now, let it be supposed, that by this expression our Lord meant endless misery in a future state,—I ask, is it possible our Lord should only mention this once? I ask again, can it be believed, that he who said on the cross,—“Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do,” should have ceased, but with his dying breath, to warn these men, that such a place of endless misery awaited them? I ask once more; is it possible, that he, who, when he beheld the city, “wept over it,” on account of temporal calamities in which it was soon to be involved, should shed no tears, in anticipating the endless misery of its wicked inhabitants? On the supposition, that Gehenna



is such a place, our Lord's conduct is strange and unaccountable. But on my views of the damnation of hell, our Lord's conduct excites no surprise: all is rational, and what the circumstances of the case warrant us to expect. They had rejected their promised Messiah, the measure of their iniquity they were soon to fill up, and they could not escape the damnation of hell. But let it be satisfactorily accounted for, why our Lord never afterwards said any thing to them of the damnation of hell, if thereby he meant, endless misery in the world to come.

2d, The conduct of his apostles. It is easily seen, that their conduct is in perfect agreement with that of their master before them. He never said a word about hell or Gehenna to the Gentiles. Neither do they. He never said a word more concerning Gehenna to the unbelieving Jews, after saying—"how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Neither do they. If it should be objected here,—“why did not the apostles continue to speak to the unbelieving Jews about the damnation of hell, allowing it to mean the temporal miseries coming on that generation? why should they not have continued to warn them of this, as their Lord had done before them?”—The answer to this is easy. In Luke xix. 42, our Lord told the Jews, that the things which belonged to their peace, were now hid from their eyes. Their doom was fixed, their punishment was unavoidable. Accordingly our Lord said,—“how *can ye escape* the damnation of hell?” Soon, the wrath of God was to come on them to the uttermost. This it did in the destruction of their city and temple, when such calamities came upon them, as never had been before, or ever shall be again, and unless the Lord had shortened the days, no flesh could have been saved.

In many places of the epistles, written to believers, allusions are made to the judgments of God coming on the Jewish nation, though not mentioned under the

name Gehenna. The event is not only alluded to, but spoken of as near; and Christians are exhorted to patience, and holiness, in view of it. But these very parts of the epistles, are by many, like the texts which speak of Gehenna, all applied to punishment in a future state of existence. See for example, 1 Peter iv. 17—19, and other texts, considered in my second Inquiry.

---

## SECTION V.

THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF ENDLESS MISERY CONSIDERED, DRAWN FROM THE USAGE OF GEHENNA IN THE TARGUMS, AND OTHER JEWISH WRITINGS.

If *Gehenna*, in the New Testament, means, as is generally believed, a place of *endless* misery, we might expect the evidence of this to be plain and conclusive. But, on examination, we have found, strong evidence on the opposite side of this question. We have considered all the texts in which this word occurs, and have seen, that by Gehenna our Lord referred to God's punishment of the Jewish nation. Besides, a great number of *facts* have been produced, in confirmation of this view of the subject, and which never can be reconciled with the common views entertained of *Gehenna punishment*.

But Dr. Campbell avers, Gehenna—"was in process of time considered as an emblem of hell, or the place of torment reserved for the punishment of the wicked in a future state. The name Tophet, came gradually to be used in this sense, and at length to be confined to it." It is alleged, this was its sense in the days of our Lord, and in no other sense, is it used in the New Testament. Mr. Stuart, in his Exeget. Essays, p. 141 says—

“it is admitted, that the Jews of later date, used the word *Gehenna* to denote *Tartarus*, i. e. the place of infernal punishment.” But no proof of this is offered by him from their writings. Nor does he produce any proof of the following. He says p. 146—“That the word *Gehenna* was common among the Jews, is evinced by its frequency in the oldest Rabbinical writings. It was employed by them as all confess, in order to designate *hell, the infernal region, the world of woe*. In no other sense, can it in any way be made out, that it is employed in the New Testament.” The authority, to which Mr. Stuart refers for this sense of *Gehenna*, is not the old Testament writers, but “the oldest Rabbinical writings,” and “the Jews of later date.” He adds, p. 27. “The later Hebrew, the Talmudic and Rabbinic, was not so late, but that it preceded the time when the New Testament was written.” But whether all this is truth requires examination.

From such statements as these, an argument has been urged like the following. “In the days of our Lord, *Gehenna* was commonly used among the Jews, to designate *hell*, a place of endless misery to the wicked. Our Lord and his apostles must have used it in this sense, if they meant to be understood by their hearers, unless they apprised them to the contrary. But this they did not; hence it is concluded, that *Gehenna* is used to designate the place of future punishment to all the wicked, and in no other sense is it used in the New Testament.” In reply to this argument, we observe 1st, Admitting that *Gehenna* in our Lord’s day, had obtained this sense among the Jews, the conclusion drawn from it does not follow, and for the following among other reasons. This, in no instance, was the sense of *Gehenna* in the Old Testament; and the writers of the New, used words and phrases in the sense they have there. They spoke—“*not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost*

*teacheth.*" 1 Cor ii. 13. Our Lord and his Apostles, had no occasion then to apprize their hearers, in what sense they used the term Gehenna, for they used it in the sense it had in their scriptures. Again, to suppose our Lord and his Apostles, used the term Gehenna in a sense of men's invention, is accusing them of adopting men's innovations in religion, a thing they reproved in the Jews. Again, those who use this argument respecting Gehenna, would object to its application to other words and phrases. They would be the last to assert, that our Lord and his apostles, adopted the sense which the Jews had attached to the words justification, righteousness, etc. At what point then are we to stop, if once we begin to adopt Rabbinical glosses, given to the language of scripture? But,

2d, We question the truth of the statements made, from which this conclusion is drawn. Is it true, that in our Lord's day, the term Gehenna was exclusively used among the Jews to designate *hell*, a place of future punishment for the wicked? This is roundly asserted, and has too long been taken for granted. Let us examine and see, what solid ground there is for this assertion.

Between the closing of the Old Testament canon by Malachai, and the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, about four hundred years intervened. Sometime during this period, Gehenna must have changed its sense, if in the days of our Lord, it was used to designate hell the world of woe, as Mr. Stuart affirms. That this was not its sense in the Old Testament, is indisputable, and is confessed by Dr. Campbell. Who first gave this new sense to the term Gehenna, when it was given, and how long before it came to be confined to it, we presume no man can inform us? Our design in this section, is, to notice all the Jewish writings, between the days of Malachai and that of our Lord, to ascertain, what they say about Gehenna. The following are all

the Jewish writings extant, of which we have any knowledge.

1st. *The septuagint version.* The first question to be settled is—at what time was this version made? Dr. Kennicot in his dissertation, says, p. 319, 320, “After many voluminous controversies, amongst learned writers upon the *Greek version of the Old Testament*, we seem to have three circumstances clearly ascertained—that there was no Greek version before that called the *seventy*—that the version so denominated, was made at the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, about 280 years before Christ,—and that the version, then made, was only of the Pentateuch.” I add, Jahn says, all the books were translated—“at latest, in the second century before Christ.” The septuagint version, was commenced 280 years before Christ, but was not perhaps completed, until about 150 years before this period.

2d, The only other question necessary to be decided is—do we find *Gehenna* used in the septuagint, to designate *hell, the world of woe*? No: Dr. Campbell said above, “the word *Gehenna* does not occur in the septuagint.” But here he was mistaken, for it does occur there with a slight variation in the spelling of the word. For example, see Josh. xviii. 16, where the word occurs, and is spelled *Gaienna*. The compound Hebrew word *ge enm* in both cases, is merely given in Greek letters. But it is useless to dwell on this topic, for the seventy translators, in rendering the passages from the Hebrew, where *valley of Hinnom*, and *valley of the son of Hinnom* are mentioned, never suggest, that such phrases were intended to designate *hell, or the world of woe*. No one alleges they do this. It is manifest then, that—“*in the second century before Christ*” *Gehenna* had no such sense affixed to it. If it was used then in such a sense, it received no countenance from the seventy translators. Their version,



transmitted no such sense of Gehenna to posterity. If it was used then, to designate *hell, the world of woe*, why is no trace of this sense to be found in their version? If the translators had imbibed such an idea, they had the same prejudices to give *Gehenna* such a sense, as our translators had, to give *hell* such a sense in their version, in translating Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna.

One thing here is certain. If Jesus Christ and his apostles, used Gehenna in the New Testament, to designate *hell, the world of woe*, they did not derive this sense of the word, either from the original Hebrew, or the Greek version of the seventy. Indeed, I do not find any one asserts, that such a sense of Gehenna originated in divine authority. It is not doing Jesus Christ, or his apostles any honor, to say, they adopted a sense of Gehenna so different from its usage in the Old Testament, on mere human authority. The inspired writers in the Old Testament, could not give such a sense to Gehenna, for it has never been proved, that they knew of such a *hell, a world of woe*, to which they could apply it. *Gehenna* then, when the seventy version was made, had no such meaning, but denoted the valley of Hinnom, as it does in the Hebrew Scriptures, which was not 200 years before the times of the New Testament writers. Then, it retained this meaning among the Jews in Egypt, and it is well known, they were the first in corrupting the Jewish religion, by mixing heathen opinions with it.

2d, *The Apocryphal books*. These books, are the best authority extant, respecting the religious opinions of the Jews, between the days of Malachai and the coming of Christ. Being appealed to, as authority on the point in question, and are in the hands of most English readers, let us 1st, advert to the time when the Apocryphal books were written. This question is not easily determined, for the dates of the books are uncertain. But, it is not

of much importance, to settle their dates precisely. Those who wish to see what is said on this subject, may consult Horne's introduction, Prideaux's Connections, and Jahn's Introduction. It is certain, most of them were written previous to the days of our Lord. The second book of Esdras is an exception, for some think, it was written by some Christian since that period. Gray in his key to the Old Testament says p. 531—"The second book of Esdras is not to be found in any Hebrew or Greek manuscript. It is supposed to have been originally written in the Greek language, but is extant only in a few latin copies, and in an Arabic version." He adds, p. 534—"The book was never admitted into the Hebrew canon, and there is no sufficient authority to prove, that it was ever extant in the Hebrew language. Its pretended prophecies, are not produced in evidence by Christian writers, striking as such testimony must have been, if genuine; and the book was never publicly or generally acknowledged either in the Greek or Latin church; nor was it ever inserted in the sacred catalogue, by either councils or fathers; but is expressly represented as Apocryphal by St. Jerom, who describes it as rejected by the church." But notwithstanding the date and character of this book, we have no objection to use it, and shall avail ourselves of what it says on the subject, in common with all the other books.

It should be distinctly understood by the reader, that our examination of the Apocryphal books, is merely to ascertain what were the opinions of the writers, relative to *Gehenna*. The books, we do not consider canonical, and are not referred to as proof of the *truth* of such opinions. Gray in his preface to the Apocrypha says—p. 511—"The books which are admitted into our Bibles under the description of Apocryphal books, are so denominated from a Greek word, which is expressive of the uncertainty and concealed nature of their original.

They have no title to be considered as inspired writings ; and though in respect of their antiquity and valuable contents they are annexed to the canonical books, it is in a separate division : and by no means upon an idea that they are of equal authority, in point of doctrine, with them : or that they are to be received as oracles of faith ; to sanctify opinions, or determine religious controversies." But supposing all the Apocryphal books, were written sometime during the period which intervened between the days of Malachai and the Savior ; the question then comes before us, what were the opinions entertained by the writers on the subject of punishment, in Gehenna ?

1st, Do they ever use the term *Gehenna* to designate a place of future punishment ? This has been asserted by some, but is certainly a great mistake, for the term *Gehenna* does not occur in any of the Apocryphal books. It is not used by them in any sense, and of course settles the question, that they gave no countenance to the opinion, that *Gehenna* was used among the Jews to designate *hell, the world of woe*. I might here drop the subject, for we have already ascertained the information required. But I shall pursue the subject and inquire,

2d, Do the Apocryphal writers use the term *Hades*, to designate a place of future punishment for the wicked ? The term *Hades*, occurs sixteen times in the original Apocryphal books, and is rendered as follows, in our English version of them.

1st, It is rendered *death*. See Wisdom of Solomon, chap. i. 14. It cannot mean a place of punishment here.

2d, It is rendered by our translators, "*the place of the dead*," Ecclesias. xlviii. 5, "who (Elias) didst raise up a dead man from death, and his soul from the place of the dead, by the word of the most High." The reference is here, to what the prophet did, in raising a dead man to life, recorded in the Old Testament.

When it is said he raised the "*soul* from the place of the dead," the person himself is meant, for the term *soul* is often used in the Old and New Testaments, to designate the *man* or *person*, and has been sufficiently shown in another place. In Scripture, *Sheol* or *Hades*, is represented as the place of all the dead.

3d, *Hades* is rendered the *grave*, in the following texts : Wisdom of Solomon ii. 1. Eccles. ix. 12; xiv. 12, 16; xvii. 27; xxviii. 21; xli. 4. 2 Mac. vi. 23. No one can doubt, that *Hades* in these texts, simply means *grave*, and was so understood by our translators.

4th, *Hades* occurs in the following places, and is rendered *hell*. Song verse 66. Wisdom of Solomon, xvi. 13; xvii. 14. Eccles. xxi. 10; li. 5, 6. Although *Hades* in these places, is rendered by the word *hell*, it is very obvious, it simply refers to the *grave*, or *state of the dead*. If the reader turns to all the above texts in the Apochryphal books, he will see, that *Hades* is used there in a very similar manner, as *Sheol* in the Hebrew canonical books. It is not intimated, by any of the writers, that they believed *Hades* was a place of punishment after death. Not one of them insinuates, that any person is alive in *Hades*. On the contrary, our translators as we have seen above, render *Hades* "*the place of the dead*," not the place of the living.

3d, Do the Apochryphal writers, use the term *Tartarus*, to designate a place of future punishment for the wicked? No: the term *Tartarus*, is not used in any sense, by any Apochryphal writer. None of them venture to say, what Mr. Stuart asserts, "that in the Hebrew, *Sheol*, *Hades*, there was a *Tartarus* a place of punishment for the wicked."

There are three additional places, where the word *hell* occurs in the Apocryphal books. 2 Esdras ii. 29; iv. 8; viii. 53; But any one who consults them, must conclude, from the phraseology connected with the word *hell*, that *Hades*, not *Gehenna* is used in the orig-

inal. We have seen above from Gray, that though the second book of Esdras, is "supposed to have been originally written in the Greek language," it is now only extant "in a few Latin copies, and in an Arabic version." As the passages stand in our English version, no one can suppose the writer meant to teach by them, a place of future punishment for the wicked. The *hell* mentioned, is not spoken of as a place of torment, or, that any persons are there in a state of conscious existence. The phraseology used, shows, *Sheol*, *Hades*, the *grave*, is referred to, for it is similar to the language used about *Sheol* in the Old Testament.

It is then manifest, from the above examination, that the Apocryphal writers, do not use *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus*, or *Gehenna* to designate *hell the world of woe*, as has been supposed. They do not use *Gehenna* in any way, which settles in the most satisfactory manner, the question in debate. That some of the Apocryphal writers believed in future punishment, and held other opinions not found in the Jewish scriptures, we have shown in our second inquiry, from p. 86—98, to which we refer the reader. But this only confirms what has been stated in another place, that the Jews while in Babylon, and after their return, imbibed many opinions from their intercourse with the heathen, which are not taught in their sacred books. This fact is admitted by all, and what many of these heathen opinions were, may be learned from the Apocryphal books. But none of the writers of them, designate *hell the world of woe*, by the term *Gehenna*, which shows this was not its common usage among the Jews when they were written. Now, it is certain, some of the Apocryphal books were written near the times of the New Testament, and some think, one or more of them were written after this period. Does this look, as if *Gehenna* was in common use among the Jews to designate *hell*, the world of woe? Let the reader judge.



3d, *Philo Judæus' writings*. The first question to be determined is—at what time did Philo write? Calmet answers, Philo—"was pretty far in years when he was deputed with others to go to Rome, about A. D. 40. by the Jews of Alexandria, to defend the right of citizenship of Alexandria which the Jews claimed, before the Emperor Caius." It is obvious then, that Philo must have written his works about the time our Savior was on earth.

2d, The next question is—does Philo in his writings use the term *Gehenna* to designate *hell, the world of woe*? This we have every reason to suppose he did, if in our Savior's day, *Gehenna* was used in this sense, and was, as Dr. Campbell asserts, exclusively confined to it. It is evident, Philo believed in future endless punishment. He says, the punishment of the wicked persons is to live for ever dying; and to be for ever in pains and griefs, and calamities that never cease. "See Whitby on Mark ix. 43, 44. It is not surprising Philo should believe in endless punishment, if Calmet's account of him be correct. He says,—“Philo, a famous Jewish author, of the city of Alexandria, and of the race of the Priests. He made himself so famous by his eloquence, and by his knowledge of the Philosophy of Plato, that it was commonly said of him at Alexandria, either Philo imitates Plato, or Plato imitates Philo. And the learned call him the Jewish Plato, or the second Plato.” Philo, could not have been a true Platonist without believing in endless punishment. There is every ground for supposing, that Philo would use the term *Gehenna*, if this was its sense and application in the days of our Lord to future punishment.

The question then is—does the term *Gehenna* occur in Philo's writings, designating a place of endless punishment? It is of no consequence in settling the present question, that he believed in endless punishment. No, the question is, did he use the term *Ge-*

*henna* to designate this place of punishment, which is said to have been its exclusive sense in the days of the Savior. \* In answer to this, we must say—we have never seen, or heard, that Philo's writings are quoted in proof, for this sense of Gehenna. Nor have we been able to find, that he uses the term Gehenna in any sense whatever. If he does, let his writings be quoted, that we may see what he says on the subject. No doubt they would be quoted, if they contained any proof on the point in question.

4th, *Josephus' writings.* The first question here, is, at what time did Josephus live and write? Calmet says, Josephus was—"born at Jerusalem, in the first year of the reign of Caius, A. D. 37." And his writings are all included between A. D. 70 and A. D. 100. He was then born, not far from the time of the Savior's death, and his writings appeared, about the same time with the books of the New Testament.

2d, Does Josephus then use the term *Gehenna* to designate *hell, the world of woe*? We answer no; nor have we ever seen his writings appealed to in proof of such an opinion. He gives an account, of the opinions of the Jews relative to future punishment, but does not use *Gehenna* to describe it. Whitby on Mark ix. 43, 44 quotes Josephus thus—"the Pharisees held, that the souls of the wicked were to be punished with perpetual punishment, and that there was appointed for them a perpetual prison." But he, nor no other person, so far as I know, ever quoted Josephus, to show he used the term *Gehenna* in reference to future punishment. It does not appear from Josephus' works, that any punishment after death, was believed among the Jews, until after their return from the Babylonian captivity, or near the times of the Savior. How they came to imbibed this and other heathen opinions, we have noticed already.

5th, *The Jewish Targums.* It is to these Targums

we are chiefly referred for proof, that in the days of our Lord, *Gehenna* designated *hell, the world of woe*; and in this sense it is always used in the New Testament. It is necessary then, that we examine this with care and attention. Let us 1st, ascertain the nature and number of these Targums. For the information of some of my readers, I give the following abridged account of them, from Prideaux's connections, vol. 4 pp. 560—585.

“The Chaldee paraphrases are translations of the Scriptures of the Old Testament made directly from the Hebrew text into the language of the Chaldeans; which language was anciently used through all Assyria, Babylonia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine; and is still the language of the churches of the Nestorian and Maronite Christians in those eastern parts, in the same manner as the Latin is the language of the Popish churches here in the west. And therefore these paraphrases were called Targums, because they were versions or translations of the Hebrew text into this language; for the word Targum signifieth, in Chaldee, an interpretation or version of one language into another, and may properly be said of any such version or translation: but it is most commonly by the Jews appropriated to these Chaldee paraphrases; for being among them what were most eminently such, they therefore had this name by way of eminency especially given to them.

“These Targums were made for the use and instruction of the vulgar Jews after their return from the Babylonish captivity; for, although many of the better sort still retained the knowledge of the Hebrew language during that captivity, and taught it their children, and the Holy Scriptures that were delivered after that time, excepting only some parts of Daniel and Ezra, and one verse in Jeremiah, were all written therein; yet the common people, by having so long conversed

with the Babylonians, learned their language, and forgot their own. It happened indeed otherwise to the children of Israel in Egypt; for, although they lived there above three times as long as the Babylonish captivity lasted, yet they still preserved the Hebrew language among them, and brought it back entire with them into Canaan. The reason of this was, in Egypt they all lived together in the land of Goshen; but on their being carried captive by the Babylonians, they were dispersed all over Chaldea and Assyria, and, being there intermixed with the people of the land, had their main converse with them, and therefore were forced to learn their language: and this soon induced a disuse of their own among them; by which means it came to pass, that, after their return, the common people, especially those of them who had been bred up in that captivity understood not the Holy Scriptures in the Hebrew language, nor their posterity after them. And therefore, when Ezra read the law to the people, he had several persons standing by him well skilled in both the Chaldee and Hebrew languages, who interpreted to the people in Chaldee what he first read to them in Hebrew. And afterwards, when the method was established of dividing the law into 54 sections, and of reading one of them every week in their synagogues, the same course of reading to the people the Hebrew text first, and then interpreting it to them in Chaldee, was still continued. For, when the reader had read one verse in Hebrew, an interpreter standing by did render it into Chaldee; and then the next verse being read in Hebrew, it was in like manner interpreted in the same language as before; and so on from verse to verse was every verse alternately read first in the Hebrew, and then interpreted in Chaldee to the end of the section; and this first gave occasion for the making of Chaldee versions for the help of these interpreters. And they thenceforth became necessary not only for

their help in the public synagogues, but also for the help of the people at home in their families, that they might there have the Scriptures for their private reading in a language which they understood.

“This work having been attempted by divers persons at different times, and by some of them with different views (for some of them were written as versions for the public use of the synagogues, and others as paraphrases and commentaries for the private instruction of the people,) hence it hath come to pass, that there were anciently many of these Targums, and of different sorts, in the same manner as there anciently were many different versions of the same Holy Scriptures into the Greek language, made with like different views ; of which we have sufficient proof in the Octapla of Origen. No doubt, anciently there were many more of these Targums than we now know of, which have been lost in the length of time. Whether there were any of them of the same composure on the whole Scriptures is not any where said. Those that are now remaining were composed by different persons, and on different parts of Scripture, some on one part, and others on other parts ; and are in all, of these eight sorts following. 1. That of Onkelos on the five books of Moses ; 2. That of Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the prophets, that is, on Joshua, Judges, Samuel, the two books of Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets ; 3. That on the law, which is ascribed to Jonathan Ben Uzziel ; 4. The Jerusalem Targum on the law ; 5. The Targum on the five lesser books, called the Megilloth, *i. e.* Ruth, Esther, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah ; 6. The second Targum on Esther ; 7. The Targum of Joseph, the one-eyed, on the book of Job, the Psalms, and the Proverbs ; and, 8. The Targum on the first and second book of Chronicles. On Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, there is no Targum at all, The reason



given by some for this is, because a great part of those books is written in the Chaldee language, and therefore there is no need of a Chaldee paraphrase upon them. This indeed is true for Daniel and Ezra, but not for Nehemiah ; for that book is all originally written in the Hebrew language. No doubt, anciently there were Chaldee paraphrases on all the Hebrew parts of those books, though now lost. It was long supposed that there were no Targums on the two books of Chronicles, because none such were known, till they were lately published by Beckius, at Augsburg in Germany, that on the first book A. D. 1680, and that on the second in 1683."

2d, We shall now lay before the reader what the Targums contain on the point in question. What then do the advocates of endless misery produce from them, showing that *Gehenna* was made an emblem of *hell the world of woe*? Parkhurst on the word *Gehenna* thus writes.—“ From this valley having been the scene of those infernal sacrifices, and probably too, from its continuing after the time of Josiah’s reformation, 2 Kings xxiii. 10, a place of abominable *filthiness* and *pollution* ; the Jews in our Savior’s time used the compound word *ge enm*, for hell, the place of the damned. This appears, from that word’s being thus applied by the Chaldee Targums, in Ruth ii. 12. Ps. cxl. 12. Isia. xxvi. 1—5. and xxxiii. 14. and by the Jerusalem Targum, and that of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, Gen. iii. 24. and xv. 17. comp. 2 Esdras ii. 29.”

Again, Whitby on Mark ix. 43, 44, says—“ That *Gehenna*, was by the Jews, still looked on and represented as the place in which the wicked were to be tormented by fire : so the Jerusalem Targum represents *Gehenna* which is prepared for the wicked in the world to come, as a *furnace* sparkling and flaming with fire, into which the wicked fall. And the Targum upon Ecclesiastes speaks of the fire of hell, Eccles. ix. 15 ; of the

sparks of the fire of hell, chap. x. 2. and of the wicked, who shall go to be burned in hell, chap. viii. 10. Accordingly our Lord speaks, verse 47, and Math. v. 22, of the wicked being cast into the fire of hell, and of their being cast into a furnace of fire, Math. xiii. 42. The ancient Jews held, that the punishment of the wicked in hell, should be perpetual or without end. So Judith saith, that they shall weep under the sense of their pains for ever, chap. 17."

Dr. Allen in his lecture pp. 20. 21, gives us the following account. "As the word Gehenna is a Hebrew word, it is worthy of our inquiry to ascertain the meaning attached to the word by the Jewish writers. By Gehenna the Jews understood the place of punishment, or the punishments of the wicked after the present life. The Targum of Jerusalem, on Gen. iii. 24, says, that 'two thousand years before the foundation of the world, God founded paradise for the just, and Gehenna for the impious, like a two edged sword, cutting on either side. In the midst of it he placed a raging fire, in which the wicked shall be burned.' So the Targum of Jonathan, on Isai. xxxiii. 14, says, 'that the impious are judged and delivered over to everlasting fire in Gehenna.' On Isai. lxv. 5, their punishment will be in Gehenna, where the fire burns perpetually."

The following is to be found in the Targums, on the texts to which Whitby and Parkhurst refer us.

"Ruth ii. 12. The Lord shall abundantly recompense thee in this age, for thy good work, and shall be thy complete reward to the age that shall come, from the presence of the Lord God of Israel; because thou hast come to join thyself to his people and worship, and find protection under the shadow of the majesty of his glory, and for this righteous conduct thou shalt be delivered from the punishment of Gehenna, that thy portion may be with Sarah and Ribhah, and Rachel and Lea."

“Psalm cxl. 10, 11. Let coals of fire fall from heaven upon them; let him cast them into the fire of Gehenna; into miry pits; from which let them not rise to eternal life. Let the angel of death hunt the violent man, and cast him into Gehenna.”

“Isaiah xxvi. 15. Thou hast been revealed to us, O! Lord! as about to assemble the dispersed of thy people; it shall also come to pass that thou wilt collect them from their wanderings; that thou mightest appear in thy power, to cast all the wicked into Gehenna.”

“Isaiah xxvi. 19. And those who transgress thy word, thou wilt deliver into Gehenna.”

“Isaiah xxxiii. 14. Who among us shall dwell in Zion, where the splendor of his majesty is as consuming fire? Who among us shall dwell in Jerusalem, where the wicked are to be judged, and cast into Gehenna, into everlasting burnings?”

In the Universalist expositor, vol. 2. pp. 367, 368, we have the following account of Gehenna, as collected from the Targums.—“We come, at last, to the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel; and in the latter of these, we meet, for the first time in Jewish writings, with Gehenna in the sense alledged. In the former, so far at least as the end of the paraphrase on Genesis, neither that term nor any thing else relating to our subject, occurs; and we presume that such is the case with the rest of the work, since it is nearly a literal translation, and is never quoted, by the critics, for examples in point. But in the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, Gehenna is several times used; and here, as we have already observed, it seems appropriated exclusively to scenes either of future woe, or of severe and extensive judgments in this world: perhaps, always to the former. The author speaks of Gehenna, as the place which God ‘hath prepared below for transgressors;’ to which he ‘will adjudge them in the day of trial;’ and ‘from which he will preserve his righteous servants.’ When

he redeems the captivity of his people, 'he will appear in his power, in order to cast all the impious into Gehenna.' It is 'prepared, of old, for the nations that have oppressed Israel: the King eternal hath prepared it deep and wide; a flaming pile is kindled therein, as of much wood; and the word of the Lord as a torrent of sulphur sets it on fire! The dissemblers, in their terror, exclaim, 'who among us shall dwell in Jerusalem, where the impious are to be judged and sent into Gehenna with eternal burning.' 'The blessed shall see them descending into the land of Gehenna;' such as say, 'stand by thyself, come not near unto me, for I am holier than thou,—shall have their punishment in Gehenna, where the fire burns continually; and their bodies shall be delivered to the second death! When all people shall come 'from month to month, and from sabbath to sabbath, to worship before the Lord, they shall go forth and behold the carcasses of the sinners who have despised the word of the Lord; their souls die not, and their fire is not quenched; and they shall be judged in Gehenna, until the righteous shall say of them, we have seen enough,' etc. Such is the language in which this author speaks of Gehenna. And we may repeat, that it is not only in a different style, but under a different name, that he mentions the valley of Hinnom. At the date of this Targum, therefore, we may conclude that the term had become appropriated by the Jews to a place of future torment. Nothing remains, but to point out the age of the work."

3d, we shall now examine at what time the Jewish Targums were written. Jahn in his introduction to the Old Testament, pp. 64—68, thus writes, "The Chaldee paraphrases are known by the name of Targums. (Which means *a version* or *an interpretation*.) The most celebrated among them is that of the Pentateuch, ascribed to Onkelos, whom the Babylonian Talmud makes contemporary with Gamaliel, adding

many incoherent tales respecting him: It is evident however, that he lived several centuries before the Talmudical writers, since they know so little of him, although he wrote in Babylonia. Onkelos, therefore, would seem to have written not in the fourth or fifth century of the Christian era, but in the third or rather in the second, and this is confirmed by his paraphrase itself," etc.

Jahn says, concerning the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the prophets—"the work is a collection of interpretations of several learned men, made towards the close of the third century, and containing some of a much older date: for that some parts of it existed as early as in the second century, appears from the additions," etc.

Respecting the Targum of the Pseudo Jonathan on the Pentateuch, Jahn says,—that it was not written before the seventh or eighth century. It seems however to have been compiled from older interpretations."

As to the Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch, Jahn observes—"this work is more modern than that of the Pseudo—Jonathan, or certainly not more ancient. It seems to have been compiled, however, from more ancient works, and hence contains many sentences which are found in the New Testament," etc. Jahn adds—"the other chaldee paraphrases are neither older nor better, than the preceding, but abound with digressions and fictions."

We have quoted Jahn's authority, respecting the age of the Jewish Targums, because he stands very high as a writer among orthodox people. The following from the Universalist Expositor, generally confirm his statements. In p. 368, speaking of the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel, it is said—"This is uncertain. Prideaux, together with several of the old critics, and even Gesenius among the living, place it not far from the christian era, on the authority chiefly of Jewish tradi-



tions. Prideaux, however, has well observed, that ‘in historical matters, it is not to be regarded what the Jews write or what they omit.’ Most of the eminent writers now agree, that it could not have been completed till some time between two and four hundred years after Christ. Dr. Jahn thinks it, a collection of the interpretations of several learned men, made towards the end of the third century, and containing some of a much older date.” Eickhorn says that “Jonathan certainly lived later than the birth of Christ;” and judging from his style, his fables, his perversion of the prophecies concerning the Messiah, and from the profound silence of the early Jews and Christian fathers, he concludes that his compilation cannot have been made before the fourth century. The same circumstances that Eickhorn adduces, are thought by Bertholdt to indicate the second or third century; and he is confident that the collection ‘cannot have attained its complete form, before the end of the second century.” With these general conclusions, it is said that Bauer likewise agrees; and some critics, have referred the work to as late a period as the seventh or eighth century.

Such is the account, which the various critics give, of the dates of the Jewish Targums. We shall now submit a few brief remarks for the consideration of our readers.

1st, Those who refer us to the Targums for proof, that *Gehenna* in the days of our Lord, was used among the Jews to designate *hell*, *the world of woe*, seldom quote what they say, on this subject, fully and fairly to their readers. Mr. Stuart makes no quotations at all, in proof of his assertions, nor does he even name the books, or pages where such proof may be found. We suspect, he was somewhat ashamed to do this, for what man, tender of his own reputation, would quote the silly remarks, which Dr. Allen quoted from the Jewish Targums, given

above. No madman, ever said more silly and ridiculous things, than are to be found in the Jewish Talmud and Targums. The Targums, most commonly referred to, in proof of such a sense given to Gehenna by the Jews, are those, into which the writers introduced their own —“glosses and silly stories, fables, prolix explications, and other additions.”

2d, Let the reader observe, the texts on which the Targums are written, afford no foundation for such a sense being given to the term Gehenna. This term, is not used in the texts in any sense whatever; nor is the writer in any of the texts, speaking either of future punishment, or a future world. None of the texts, afford the shadow of a ground for saying Gehenna means *hell, the world of woe*. There is no connection, between the text and the comment given on it by the Targumists. They might have given the same comment, in any other text in the bible, with equal propriety. If the texts then, afforded no foundation for such comments, why were they made, and why should christians regard them?

3d, But what decides the question at issue is—The Targums were not written in the days of our Lord, consequently cannot be quoted as proof, that in his day, Gehenna among the Jews designated *hell, the world of woe*. It was impossible in the nature of the case, that our Lord derived this sense of Gehenna from the Jewish Targums, as the dates of them show. They were not in existence, until several hundred years after our Lord was on earth, as the best critics have testified above. Why then, are they appealed to at all, in proof of this? And on what ground did Mr. Stuart assert, that the later Jewish writers, gave such a sense to Gehenna, prior to the writing of the New Testament? It appears from the following quotation, the facts are very different.

“From the time of Josephus, onwards, there is an

interval of about a century, from which no Jewish writings have descended to us.—In this period, we meet with the first information which we receive from any quarter whatsoever, that Gehenna was the place of the damned. Still, it is not from a Jew, that this earliest notice comes, but from the celebrated christian father, Justin Martyr, about A. D. 150. He quotes the language of our Savior, ‘fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna,’ and then adds, for the instruction of the heathen’s to whom he was writing, that Gehenna is the place where those are to be punished who have led unrighteous lives, and disbelieved what God declared by Christ. This is of course, merely his interpretation of that term, as he understood it in the New Testament; and notwithstanding he had been brought up in one of the cities of the ancient Samaria, he certainly had no acquaintance with the language, and probably none with the peculiar usages, of the Jews.

“The next notice of the kind, is, we think, that of another christian father, Clemens Alexandrinus, about A. D. 195. Maintaining the doctrine of a future state, he adduces the authority of the heathen philosophers: ‘Does not Plato acknowledge both the rivers of fire, and that profound depth of the earth which the barbarians (the Jews) call Gehenna? Does he not prophetically mention Tartarus, Coytus, Acheron, the Phlegethon of fire, and certain other like places of punishment, which lead to correction and discipline?’ Here Clemens meant, beyond all doubt, that the Jews denominated the place of future punishment, Gehenna; but whether he spoke from personal knowledge or from presumption, it is altogether uncertain. He knew it to be a Jewish, not a Greek, word; and he may have judged its usage among the Barbarians, as he called them, by what he supposed its sense in the New Testament.” Universalist Expositor vol’ 2. pp. 361, 366.

4th, But supposing the Targums to have been written prior to the days of Christ, yea let it be supposed, that among the Jews in his day, the current sense of Gehenna was—*hell, the world of woe*, what does this prove? It does not prove, that this sense was given to Gehenna by divine authority. Nor does it prove, that our Lord used it in this sense. On the contrary, there is not the least foundation for supposing, that he would lay aside the Old Testament sense of Gehenna, and adopt this new sense on the authority of men, and especially such writers as the authors of the Targums. Jesus Christ gave no countenance to men's inventions in religion, or sanctioned the alterations which the Jews had made on the ideas or language of their scriptures. The whole of his teaching proves this; and the texts with their contexts, where he used the term Gehenna, stand opposed, as we have seen above, to such a sense given to this word. Besides, the facts we have adduced, never can be reconciled with this sense attached to the term Gehenna. But if people will contend, that the authority of the Targums is good, in establishing that *Gehenna* in our Lord's day meant *hell, the world of woe*, they can have no reasonable objection to receiving it as good, in a case closely connected with this. I shall therefore submit for their serious consideration the following observations.

1st, If the Targums are good authority, that Gehenna is a place of endless punishment, their authority is equally good, in determining who are to suffer it. Permit me then to adduce the same authority, from Whitby on Rom. ii. to show, that no Jew went to hell to be punished forever, but all the Gentiles are fit fuel for hell fire. He says,—“The Jewish religion was very much corrupted at our Savior's coming, so that they thought it sufficient to obtain God's favor, and to secure them from his judgments,—1st, That they were of *the seed of Abraham*; and hence the Baptist speaks thus to them, *bring*

*forth fruits meet for repentance*, and (think it not sufficient to) *say within yourselves, we have Abraham for our father*, Matth. iii. 8, 9. The Chaldee paraphrasts do often mention their expectation of being preserved for the merits or good works of their forefathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; and their writers add, that *hell fire hath no power over the sinners of Israel, because Abraham and Isaac descend thither to fetch them thence*. 2d, They held that circumcision was of sufficient virtue to render them accepted of God, and to preserve them from eternal ruin; for they teach that *no circumcised person goes to hell*; God having promised to deliver them from it *for the merit of circumcision*; and having told Abraham, that *when his children fell into transgression, and did wicked works, he would remember the odor of their foreskins, and would be satisfied with their piety*. And, 3d, They taught that *all Israelites* had a portion in the world to come; and that notwithstanding their sins, yea though they were condemned here for their wickedness: whereas, of all the Gentiles, without exception, they pronounce that *they are fuel for hell fire*." Let persons then, who quote the Targums in proof, that Gehenna or hell is a place of endless misery, take their choice. They must either reject their authority altogether, or be willing to go to hell on the same authority; as Gentiles we must all be content to be *fuel for hell fire*. Let us then make up our minds, whether we shall, for the sake of maintaining the authority and honor of the Targums in the one case, be willing to submit to the punishment they assign us in the other. We must either accept of both or reject both.—We might here take our leave of the Targums: for what has now been stated, is sufficient to convince any man, that their authority is not for a moment to be regarded. But we shall proceed.

2d, Parkhurst says, that, "the Jews in our Savior's time used the compound word *ge enm*, for hell, the



place of the damned. And he adds, that "this appears from that word's being thus applied by the Chaldee Targums, and by the Jerusalem Targums, and that of Ben Uzziel." And why does it not also *appear*, that all the stories, and glosses, and fables, which they introduced into their Targums, are also true? We have the same authority for the one as for the other. If it should be said, that the Targums are only appealed to for the manner in which the Jews used this word, we reply, that this is not the whole truth, for it is in the way the Jews did use this word in the Targums, that the doctrine is attempted to be proved. The sense in which our Lord used the word Gehenna is assumed, and the Targums are appealed to, not only for the sense of this word, but for the truth of the doctrine. Let it be shown, from the context of the passages in which it is used, that this is its sense, and there is no necessity to appeal to the Targums. But if it be true, which is stated in the above quotation, why does it not also appear, that the Gentiles were fuel for hell fire? By this way of making things *appear to be true*, it will be no difficult thing to show, that all the silly, sick-brained stories of the Apocrypha, Targums, and Talmuds, are true. Besides, by the same rule, we ought to believe, that the fire of hell is literal, material fire, for the Targumists appear to have believed this, as is plain from the above quotation. But notice, Whitby says, that "the Jewish religion was very much corrupted at our Savior's coming." By what evidence does it then appear, that the Gentiles were fuel for hell fire, and that this is a corruption of their religion, but that hell fire itself was not also a part of this corruption? Neither of these is taught in the Old Testament. From what source, then, do we learn, that both are not a corruption of their religion? How could they be any thing else but a corruption of it, when not found in their Scriptures? If this is denied, let proof be produced to the

contrary. After reading the above quotation from Whitby, *no one can doubt* that the Jewish religion was *very much corrupted*. It was a corruption, however, as any one may see, which flattered themselves, and sufficiently expressed their enmity against the Gentiles. After seeing this quotation, and considering the strange and ridiculous opinions held by the Jews, what credit can any man give, to any thing such persons could say about Gehenna, being a place of endless misery? One would certainly be disposed to think, that, so far from the doctrine being true, it was invented for the purpose of showing their deep-rooted aversion to Gentiles. If Gehenna, held by them to be a place of endless misery, be a truth, yet all the other things stated in the above quotation are considered corruptions of their religion, we honestly own, that we have seldom seen a truth held with so many absurd notions. To say the least of it, the testimony of such witnesses, is very suspicious.

3d, But we should like to know, how the writers of the Targums quoted above, came by the information, which they detail to us concerning Gehenna? By what means did they come to know, that it was a place of punishment for the wicked, that the punishment was to be literal fire, and endless in its duration? I repeat the question,—Where did the above persons get all this information? Did they derive it from the heathen, or did they invent it themselves? If from neither of these sources, let it be shown from what source they did derive it. Until it is proved, that this information was derived from God's authority, no man ought to believe it.

But it may be objected to this, by saying, is it not said, in the above quotations, that our Lord speaks, Mark ix. 47. and Matth. v. 22. of the wicked being cast into the fire of hell, and of their being cast into a furnace of fire, Matth. xiii. 42?" The two first of these passages have been considered, being two of those in which

Gehenna occurs. It has been shown, that Gehenna in no instance, signifies a place of endless misery for the wicked. As to the last passage, we have shown in our second Inquiry, that it has nothing to do with a place of endless misery, but refers to the same temporal calamities which are spoken of under the emblem of Gehenna, by the prophet Jeremiah. It is there shown, our Lord did not derive his allusion to a "furnace of fire" in the above passage, from the Targums, but from the Old Testament Scriptures. It is very certain, all professing Christians, not only in our day, but for many ages past, have believed, that Gehenna is the place of eternal punishment for all the wicked. One should think, that it would not be difficult to show, from what source this information was derived. We might also expect, that instead of referring to the Targums, God's authority would be appealed to at once, and the Scripture evidence of its truth, would be full and explicit. A subject of such universal and deep interest to the human race, we think, would not be left as a matter of doubtful disputation, depending on the sense which the writers of the Targums give to the word Gehenna. Even when such writings are appealed to, they afford no proof of the doctrine, and give us but a poor opinion of either the piety of the writers, or the correctness of their religious opinions. If eternal punishment in Gehenna, be a part of the revealed will of God, at some time or other this revelation must have been given. Now, I am willing to believe it, and shall teach it with all the ability God has given me, if it can be shown such a revelation has been given, during any part of the four following periods of time: which includes all periods in which it could be revealed.

1st, I shall believe it, if it can be proved, that it was revealed at any time during the Old Testament dispensation. That such a doctrine, as the eternity of hell torments, was not revealed during this period, is now

generally admitted. It is confessed by Mr. Stuart and others, that it was not revealed under the name of Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, or even Gehenna, during that dispensation : and it is not pretended, that any other name is used to express this place of *endless* punishment. I therefore observe

2d, That I shall believe this doctrine, if it can be proved, that God revealed it in any time from the completion of the Old Testament Scriptures, to the commencement of the gospel dispensation. The time which elapsed between these two events, was about four hundred years. Malachi, in closing his book, commanded attention to be given to the law of Moses, until the coming of John the Baptist, but gives no injunction to pay attention to the Apocrypha or the Targums. And we have no account, during the above period, that any inspired prophet arose, and revealed such a doctrine to the world. To quote any writer from Malachi to John the Baptist, in proof of this doctrine, is nothing to the purpose.

3d, I will believe this doctrine, if it is proved, that God revealed it since the New Testament was completed. This is not supposed, for it is contended by all who hold it, that it was known long before this. To contend that it was revealed after the New Testament was completed, would be to give it up as a Scripture doctrine, and sanction all the wild pretensions to inspiration since that period. If we do not end our revelations with the New Testament, we shall have a host of inspired fanatics, and an inundation of enthusiastical reveries, for the faithful sayings of God.

4th, I will believe this doctrine if it can be proved, that it has been revealed by God to men, during the ministry of Christ or any of his apostles : or, in other words, if it can be proved from the New Testament. All the passages where Gehenna occurs we have considered, and we think have shown, that no such doctrine is

taught in them. Besides, we have adduced a number of facts, at variance with such a view of the subject. But we have a few remarks to make on the above quotations, of a different nature from those already made.

1st, There is considerable similarity, in the opinions held by the Targumists, and Christians in the present day. I need not notice, that both are agreed, Gehenna means *hell*, *world of woe*, for this is obvious. But it deserves special notice, the similarity of their opinions, as to those who must go to hell. The Jews considered *all Gentiles fuel for hell fire*, but exempted themselves from this punishment. No Jew could go to hell; or if he did—"hell fire hath no power over the sinners of Israel, because Abraham and Isaac descend thither to fetch them thence." The "merit of circumcision," and "the odor of their foreskins," was sufficient to preserve them from hell. Such was the faith of the persons, on whose authority we are to believe, Gehenna to be a place of endless misery. Christians now retaliate on the Jews, and consider them fit fuel for hell fire. Christians also believe, no *Christian* shall go to hell. Ask any one of them, do you believe you shall go to hell? Oh, no, say they, God forbid we should go to hell. But why not? The reasons they assign, are very similar to those the Jews assigned. They are the children of Godly parents; they have been baptized; they are members of the church. These, or similar things, have put all their fears to rest about going to hell. The fact is, I never met with a person in my lifetime, who believed hell was a place of punishment for himself. No, this is for the wicked Jews; the heathen; or, wicked persons around them. We have even known some good people, who, while their children lived, considered them as on the broad road to hell, but when they died, without much evidence of a change, still hoped they were gone to heaven. This conduct of their's, has reminded us of the conduct of the ancient



Romans with their Cæsars. While they lived, they counted them devils, but after death, deified them.

2d, But how came the Jews to believe in a place of endless misery, and at length came to use the term *Gehenna* to express it? There are several points fixed about this, which enable us to form at least a rational conjecture respecting it. Let it then be observed, Mr. Stuart, Dr. Campbell, and others, seem to admit, that a place of endless punishment is not taught in the Old Testament. Here is one point fixed. Again, it is admitted by all, that the term *Gehenna*, nor no other term, is used in the Old Testament, to express a place of endless punishment. Indeed, it was impossible to use *Gehenna* in such a sense, if no such place was known, for a place must first be known, before we can give it a name of any kind. Here is another point fixed on the question before us. Again, it is stated by Dr. Campbell, and others, that during, and after the Babylonian captivity, the Jews came to learn from the heathen, the notion of endless punishment in a future state. This we have seen above. The introduction of this, and other heathen opinions among the Jews, was gradual, but in the days of our Lord had become general, with perhaps the exception of the sect of the Sadducees. But though they learned from the heathen, this notion of a place of endless punishment, they could not learn from them, to call it by the name *Gehenna*, for this was a Hebrew term. Another point which seems to be certain is—the Jews from a variety of causes, had imbibed a deep rooted hatred of the Gentile nations. They counted them dogs, and excluded them from all participation in the blessings of their Messiah's reign. It is also universally admitted, that no place known to a Jew, was more abominable than *Gehenna*, the valley of Hinnom. Jahn in his *Archeology*, p. 527, says—"in the later periods of the Jewish kingdom, this idol was erected in the valley

south of Jerusalem, viz. *in the valley of Hinnom*, and in the part of said valley called Tophet, so named from the *drums* which were beaten to prevent the groans and cries of children sacrificed, from being heard, Jer. vii. 31, 32. xix. 6—14. Isai. xxx. 33. 2 Kings xxiii. 10. The place was so abhorrent to the minds of the more recent Jews, that they applied the name *Ge Hinnom* or Gehenna to the place of torments in a future life. The word *Gehenna* is used in this way, (viz. for the place of punishment beyond the grave,) very frequently in oriental writers, as far as India. Compare Wetsten's New Testament, at Math. v. 5."

Such are the points which seem to be fixed relative to this subject. From these facts, we may form a rational conjecture, how the Jews came to use the term Gehenna to express a place of endless punishment in a future state. They did not so apply this term, to express a place of endless punishment to themselves. No: let it be noticed, it was so used to express a place of endless punishment to the Gentile nations. No Jew could suffer the torments of hell. But all the Gentiles were fit fuel for hell fire. The Jews had even no dealings with the Samaritans; and they counted it proper to hate their enemies. Math. v. 43. See how strong this prejudice was, even in the minds of Christ's own followers, Acts chapters x. and xi. The whole New Testament, shows to what extent self-righteousness, self love, national pride, and vanity had taken possession of the minds of the Jews. The quotation made from Whitby, on Rom. ii. above, shows the malignant hatred which the Jews had to the Gentiles. To express this hatred of them, they consigned them to hell fire; and it is a probable conjecture, that as no place was more abominable to Jews than Gehenna, they used the term Gehenna to express the place of endless punishment to the Gentile nations. This conjecture, the reader must easily perceive, seems to be countenanced from the quo-

tation from Whitby, and also from the accounts given from the Targums respecting Gehenna. But at this distance of time, we have no hope of being ever able to determine, when, or by whom, this new sense was first given to Gehenna. That it was not from divine authority, seems certain, and in the nineteenth century, it is high time for Christians to discard all human authority in the things of religion.

We have now finished our examination of the term Gehenna. The result to which we have come, and the evidence by which we have arrived at it, are before the reader, let him judge for himself. In conclusion we would observe.

1st, If any person believes my views are unscriptural, the first step to be taken, to convince me of my error, is, to account rationally for the facts I have stated. Until these are fairly removed out of the way, it is impossible for me to believe, Gehenna in the New Testament, designates *hell, a world of woe*. Let any candid man examine these facts, and then say, if it is possible with such facts in view, any rational man can believe this doctrine. They form a phalanx of difficulties, which is impenetrable, against its reception. Upon no part of this whole Inquiry, has more labor of thinking been bestowed, than in attempting to reconcile the facts with the common opinion, that Gehenna designates a place of endless punishment to the wicked. We have turned this subject round, and viewed it on all sides, with all the attention we could command. I can sincerely say, I have sought, but sought in vain, to find something which could fairly account for the facts, and reconcile them with this doctrine. The more I have labored in this way, the facts have increased against it. And I am persuaded, if the labor was continued they would still increase, for I am not convinced that the subject is exhausted.

2d, The next step to be taken, to convince me of my

error, if it be one, is, to examine all the texts which speaks of Gehenna, and show that I have misinterpreted them. When this is done, there will be no need to refer me to the Jewish Targums for proof, that Gehenna in the New Testament means *hell, a world of woe*, for I will believe the doctrine, without any appeal to their authority. The only question to settle with me is—has God revealed this doctrine in the Bible? If he has, this is enough for me. But if he has not, popular belief, the Jewish Targums, all human authority I reject without hesitation.

3d, That Gehenna in the New Testament means *hell, the world of woe*, is assumed. The most plausible argument in favor of this sense, is, its usage in the Targums. But, if this argument ever had any force, it is now seen, it was derived from a mistaken opinion, that the Targums existed prior to the days of our Lord. This has always been taken for granted, as if it ought not, yea could not be questioned. How this case stands, let the reader now judge; from the evidence laid before him. Should it still be said, Gehenna is to be found in this sense, in Jewish writings prior to the days of our Lord, I demand that the names and dates of these writings be given, and let them be quoted, that all may see what they say on this subject. Assertions prove nothing; and if evidence can be produced, why withhold it, for who can believe without it?

4th, If the true sense of Gehenna in the New Testament, is to be learned from its usage in the Targums, but very few persons can understand the scriptures on this subject. Not one in ten thousand ever heard of such writings, and not one in a million of our race ever saw them, or have had an opportunity to consult them. Can any man believe, God has left his rational offspring at the mercy of such interpreters of the true sense of Gehenna? It is allowed, the bible is the religion of protestants; and no maxim is more true than this—

*“the bible is the best interpreter of itself.”* Why then go to the writers of the Targums, enemies of Christ and of Christianity, to learn, that Gehenna means *hell, world of woe*? How could they tell, that in this sense he used Gehenna, if they wrote several hundred years after our Lord was on the earth? They did not hear him deliver his discourses, in which he speaks of Gehenna, and if they had, there was some temptation on their part to pervert his meaning. He announced punishment to their nation under the emblem of Gehenna — *“how can ye escape the damnation of hell.”*

5th, To quote as authority the Targums, or even the christian fathers, that Gehenna means *hell, world of woe*, in the New Testament, is a plain concession, that such a sense is not to be found in the bible. If universalists, depended on such authority for the truth of universal salvation, their cause would be deemed indefensible. They would be looked on as weak, silly, credulous people; obstinately attached to a false system, which cannot be supported by scripture authority. But do they support their views of Gehenna, or any other part of their system, by such kind of authority as this? No. We have appealed to evidence and argument drawn from scripture, for the views we have advanced about Gehenna, and invite a refutation, by an appeal to the same authority. All we have had to do with the Targums, and other Jewish writings, has been, in exposing the rotten foundation on which the common doctrine rests about Gehenna punishment.

---



## SECTION VI.

## OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

THERE is not a truth revealed in the Bible, against which one opposed to it, may not start objections. It would, however, be a waste of time, and a very trifling employment, to answer every *silly* objection which might be made. All will allow, that *objections* which are *rational*, and which *affect* the subject against which they are brought, demand an answer. Every objection which has occurred to myself, or has been suggested by others, of any weight against the views which have been advanced, I shall now attempt to consider. These objections divide themselves into two classes; *common popular objections*, and, *objections which are urged against the argument adduced*. Let us begin with the first of these.

One of the most popular objections, is, that my sentiments are of a *licentious tendency*. It is remarked, “if you do away Gehenna or hell as a place of endless punishment for the wicked, *what is left to deter men from the commission of every crime?*” Indeed, say some, *if I believed there was no hell, I would indulge myself in all kinds of iniquity!* Look, say they, at the loose principles, and still more loose morals, of the Universalists; and add, by way of triumph, who ever heard of a revival of religion among them?” It will be allowed, that I have stated this objection fully and fairly. It shall now be my business, as fully and fairly to meet it.

1st, It is said, “if hell, a place of endless punishment is done away, what is left to deter men from the commission of crime?” In reply to this, I remark—1st, Under the Old Testament dispensation, it is allowed that the doctrine of endless hell torments was not known. Suffer me then to ask, what was left to de-

ter men from crime, before this doctrine had existence? When these persons have told us, what was left in *those days* to deter men from crime *without it*, we are prepared to inform them what can deter men *in these days without it*. And *if this doctrine, was not preached under the Old Testament to make men holy, how came any then to be holy without it?* Did Adam, preach the doctrine of hell torments to Cain to make him holy? Did Noah, preach this doctrine to make the antideluvians holy? Did Lot, preach this doctrine to make the Sodomites holy? Yea, was the belief of this doctrine the cause of the holiness of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Lot, and a host of others? Did the belief of hell torments make them holy, in distinction from those who were unholy? If this was the cause of their being holy themselves, why did they not preach this doctrine to make their friends, neighbors, and indeed all mankind, holy? If this doctrine was believed in those days, and was so well fitted as is supposed, to prevent wickedness, why was it not preached? Surely, Noah ought to have preached it to the people of the old world, when all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth. He was a preacher of righteousness, but I do not find a hint given in his history, that he was a preacher of hell torments to deter men from their licentious courses. Besides; why did not Lot preach it to the Sodomites to make them holy? They were sinners before the Lord exceedingly, but I do not find that he believed this doctrine to keep himself holy, or preached it to others to deter them from licentiousness. Not a word is said which would lead one to conclude, that the antideluvians and Sodomites were all believers in the doctrine of universal salvation, and that this was the cause of their wickedness, but that Noah, Lot, and others, believed in the doctrine of hell torments, and that this led them to holiness.

2d, If the doctrine of hell torments, is so well calcu-

lated to prevent sin, and promote holiness, why did not our Lord teach it to the Jews, who are allowed to have been a race of very wicked men? Can any man believe that by the *damnation of hell*, our Lord meant a place of eternal misery, that he thought it well fitted to prevent licentiousness, yet only mentioned it once to the unbelieving Jews? Did he think, there was nothing left, to prevent men from committing all manner of iniquity, and yet but once, and that in a discourse relating to the destruction of Jerusalem, said to them—"how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" It is not the easiest thing in the world, for us to believe this.

3, It is an indisputable fact, that the apostles of our Lord, never said a word about hell to the Gentiles. We ask then, what they had left to deter them from the commission of every crime? If they knew that hell was a place of endless misery for the wicked, and thought it such an excellent antidote against licentiousness, why did they never make use of it? They must have either been ignorant of such a doctrine, or very culpable in not preaching it, to deter men from crime; or they did not consider it so efficacious as the objector imagines. The Gentile nations in the apostle's days, were very licentious. And it appears from chap. i. sect. 3. that they were also believers in the doctrine of eternal misery in Tartarus. But we see, that the belief of this doctrine, did not turn them from their licentious courses. Nor did the apostles of our Lord think the preaching of eternal misery, either in Hades, or Gehenna, would effect this; for they do not say one word to them about punishment in either of those places. Let the objector then account for it, if the apostles were of his mind about this, why they did not preach this doctrine to prevent wickedness in their day. And let him account for it, why the Gentiles in believing it, should be so licentious. If the prophets, Jesus Christ, or his apostles, did not teach eternal torments in hell to promote holiness,

ought not their doctrine to be charged with a licentious tendency as well as mine? There is no way of evading this, but by proving, that they did teach this doctrine to mankind. This we think never can be done. If I am then to be condemned, how are they to be cleared? And if their doctrine did not lead to licentiousness, how, in justice, can the views I have advanced be charged with it. I shall not feel much ashamed at being found in such company. These facts, are sufficient to put down this objection forever. Nor need we be alarmed, that the doctrine will produce an increase of iniquity, when the inspired writers never used the opposite doctrine, to check the progress of sin in the world. They had certainly something left to deter men from sin, and which they deemed so efficacious, as to supercede the necessity of the doctrine of hell torments.

4th, Let us inquire, what that was, which they deemed sufficient without it. Paul says, "the goodness of God," and not hell torments, leadeth men to repentance. It is "the grace of God," not *hell torments*, which teacheth men to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts. It is the "love of Christ," not hell torments, which constrains men not to live to themselves, but to the glory of God. All, who are acquainted with the scriptures know, to what extent I might here refer to texts of a similar nature, showing the same thing; but I forbear. Here then was the sovereign remedy, which they proposed, to cure a licentious world. If this failed, they had no other to propose. All other remedies which people have tried to effect it, have been like the woman, who spent her all on other physicians, but rather grew worse. The love of God in the gift of his Son, is that which when believed, and its influence felt constrains to love and to good works. Every thing else to effect a cure without this, is only religious quackery, and this we deem the very worst kind of quackery. But

5th, Those persons, who aver, that if the doctrine

of hell torments is done away, there is nothing left to deter men from the commission of every crime, must certainly think, that where this doctrine is taught, it greatly tends to prevent wickedness. I believe that this will be strongly contended for. Is this then true? Can it be established by sufficient evidence? Has the preaching of hell torments to mankind, produced such glorious effects, as such persons would have us believe? Our actual observation of its effects, we admit is very limited. But we have seen a little of it, at least in two quarters of the globe, and we think facts will warrant us to say, that hell torments, and heathenish morality have been preached to people, until they have been preached into the grossest immorality. Was not this tried for ages among the Gentile nations, but did it turn them from sin to God? No; it was when the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe. Besides, our own actual observation does not lead us to think, that where the doctrine of hell torments is most preached, there the people are most holy.

6th, But admitting that the preaching of hell torments did deter men, in many cases, from the commission of crimes,—what opinion are we to form of the morality produced by such a cause? We do not envy that parent, the respect and obedience which he receives from his wife and children, who obtains it from the fear of being cast into a furnace of fire! This might do well enough for an eastern despot, but no rational man, far less the God of the universe, would think this true obedience or morality. We venture to say, that such a course to produce obedience, either to men or to God, is as bad state policy, as it is false divinity. It shows as much ignorance of human nature, as it displays a want of common humanity. In the preaching of Jesus Christ and his apostles, I do not find any attempts made, to frighten men from their licentious courses into reli-



gion, by terrific descriptions of hell torments. They had so many rational arguments, to induce men to obedience to God, that they never made use of it. Had they deemed it, of as much importance as the objector, we have no doubt but that they would have preached it to the world. At any rate, he must first prove that they did preach this doctrine, before his objection is of any force.

7th, The Apostle's doctrine of salvation by grace, through faith, was denounced as leading to licentiousness. Let us sin, said the objector, because grace aboundeth. Now, we should like to know, how salvation in this way to all, should be of a licentious nature, and not also to a few? The truth is, the number saved, can make no difference in the case. If the doctrine is licentious when extended to the whole human race, it must be so though, limited to a single individual. But every one knows how the apostles refuted the objection. "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid: how shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" We repel the charge in the same way. But, the persons who bring this charge against us, seem to think, that because no hell torments are prepared, that men are to go to heaven without any Savior or salvation. We believe no such doctrine. On the contrary, we firmly believe, that all are saved from their sins, reconciled to God, and made meet for heaven. If there be any Universalists, who believe otherwise, we disown them, and would be glad to have them give up the name until they have relinquished such principles. But we never heard of any Universalists, who held the opinion, that persons go to heaven in their sins. No: in their writings and preaching they disclaim it, and consider it not very candid, nor honorable in their opponents, to bring such a charge against them.

Should it be said here, "but whatever they pretend, do you not see a great many who profess to be Univer-

salists, living very licentious lives?" We freely grant this, but if this is any argument against the doctrine, it is one which will prove a great deal too much. It will prove equally against the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Methodists, the Unitarians, and in short, every religious denomination in the world. Do you not find, many who profess the principles of all these sects, who live licentious lives? We are sorry to say, that this is but too evident. But this kind of argument, would even prove the principles of the Bible to be licentious. Are there not many, who profess its principles, who lead licentious lives? Yes, alas! too many. But you will seldom find, that the disciples of Paine, or Voltaire, are so uncandid, and reason so incorrectly as to conclude, that the Bible is of a licentious tendency in its principles, because many who profess them are very wicked men. But, say the objectors, those licentious persons who profess to believe the Bible, and of the above sects, do not understand the principles they profess. Granted. And why will not the objectors also allow, that many who *profess* to be Universalists, do not *understand* the principles which *they* profess. If it is no reproach to the other sects to have such kind of professors, why should it be any reproach to the Universalists? The fact is, such kind of professors, are no honor to any denomination professing the Christian name, and we once heard of a sect of Deists, who would not have received them into their community, for they would not admit an immoral person among them. We are sure, the fact is too evident to be disputed, that wherever the eternity of hell torments has been published, and published too in all the horrors with which human eloquence could decorate it, and enforced with all the clerical dignity and civil authority, that popes, priests, and kings could afford, it has not prevented wickedness in the earth. In my judgment, it has produced immorality and other evil consequences, which human nature, bad as it is, condemns.

Should an appeal be made to facts, by comparing the numbers of those who have lived licentiously, embracing the various religious systems which have been in the world, we are not prepared to admit that the balance of the account would be against Universalists. But admitting that it was greatly against them, all that this could prove, is, that their views tend more to licentiousness than the others. All these different systems produce it to a certain extent, but that of the Universalists is the most prolific. But such a mode of reasoning is false, for it is allowed, that an argument which proves both sides of a question, cannot be a good one. The fact is, that persons professing the very best principles, have led licentious lives. The grace of God has been turned into lasciviousness; and, what good is there, which men have not abused?

But, if even a greater proportion of licentious men, were externally attached to the sect of Universalists, we should not be surprised, nor do we think that this proves any thing against the doctrine I have stated. When our Lord was in the world, we are told, that—"then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him." Luke xv. 1. He was also called by his enemies, "a friend of publicans and sinners." Had our Lord preached to them the doctrine of hell torments, why were they so fond of hearing him, and why was he accused of being their friend? Certainly he said nothing to encourage them to continue in sin, but the very reverse; but we think it is equally evident that he did not preach the terrors of hell torments to turn them from their iniquities. If he did not preach this doctrine, there is as little wonder that sinners flocked to hear him, as that now a great many of similar characters should flock to hear the Universalists. We think then, that, allowing a greater proportion of immoral people, should be disposed to hear the preachers who exclude the doctrine of hell torments from their preaching, the case is

not surprising. It was so in the days of our Lord, nor is there any thing in the nature of the case but what might be expected.

But it is said further, "if I believed that there was no eternal punishment in hell, I would indulge myself in all kinds of iniquity." Little need be said in reply to this; indeed it does not deserve one. But as we must reply, we would ask, is this person's holiness of the right kind? If it is, we do not see, but that God must hold up the torments of hell even in heaven, to prevent this person's becoming licentious there! When the *stimulus of hell torments is removed*, what is there to preserve such a person holy? Nothing: and even when thus prevented from licentiousness, what is his holiness good for? If it were not for his evil example in society we would say to him,—indulge in all manner of iniquity, for your wickedness will as soon bring you to heaven as your holiness. But further; it is a very evident case, that the obedience of all such persons, is the obedience of a slave under the terror of the lash. Yea, it shows very clearly, that under all this hypocritical obedience, such persons are in love with sin, and nothing under heaven prevents their outward indulgence of it, but the fear of hell torments. Indeed, the objector openly avows, that if there was no hell, he would indulge his lusts without restraint. Holiness, for its own sake, he does not love. Holiness, from love to God, he knows nothing about. And instead of pursuing it because he finds it the way of peace and comfort to himself, or of any benefit to society, he confesses it to be a burden; and, but for the terror of hell torments, he would prefer a licentious course of life. Can any Universalist be a worse character than this? and if there be a hell, can any man be found, who is a more fit subject for its punishment? The terror of hell torment is a common topic. It is held up in such a terrific point of view, that we do not much wonder the objector loses

sight of every thing else, and thinks that all he has need to be saved from, is merely from hell torments. We must here indulge ourselves with a few remarks relative to this view of the subject.

1st, To be saved from hell torments, is all the objector seems concerned about. This we fear is the case with too many. We are not much surprised that it is so ; for in preaching about hell, the chief thing held up to view, is to be saved from such a dreadful place of punishment. This theme is so much dwelt upon, and this place is described in such a way, that the hearer's mind is wholly absorbed with it. To be saved from this dreadful place, is with him the most essential part of religion.

2d, The objector is constrained to practice self-denial, much against his inclination, to avoid the torments of hell. If there was no hell he would indulge in all kinds of iniquity. But seeing that there is such a place, to avoid it, he restrains his inclinations. His holiness is the mere effect of fear. The man is chained and in fetters, and cannot act himself. Only let him loose from these, by assuring him that there are no eternal torments in hell, and he would be foremost in the ranks of licentiousness.

3d, The objector has a very wrong view, both of sin and the salvation of Jesus Christ. He thinks sin a pleasant, good thing, if it were not for the hell torments in which it must end. He plainly intimates, that this is the chief, if not the only thing, which prevents his present enjoyment of all the pleasures of sin for a season. Now, nothing is more obvious from Scripture, than this, that sin is connected with present misery ; and that truth and holiness are productive of happiness. The ways of transgressors are hard, whilst wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths lead to peace. A man that feareth the Lord, happy is he ; but though the wicked join hand in hand they shall not go unpunished. Licentiousness is inseparably connect-



ed with loss of health, reputation, and property ; besides all the pangs of remorse and mental agony to the individual. Holiness is connected with health, reputation, and temporal prosperity, in addition to peace and serenity of mind, which are worth every thing else the world can afford. But the objector does not think so ; for he seems to think, that a life of licentiousness is the most happy kind of life he could lead, and but for the dread he has of hell torments, would gratify every sinful lust and passion. But he has also a wrong view of the salvation of Jesus Christ. His mind, is so much absorbed with the subject of hell torments, that he has no idea of being saved from sin, but merely from such punishment. But the objector should remember, that our Lord received the name *Jesus*, because he should save his people from their sins. But does he find, that he received this or any other name, because he should save them from eternal torments in hell ? I do not find it once mentioned in the Bible, that Jesus is said to save any persons from hell. He came into the world to save the chief of sinners, to save men from sin, from the course of this present evil world, from ignorance, folly, crime and death ; but no inspired writer ventures to say, that he came to save men from endless punishment in Gehenna. But this view of Christ's salvation, seems, in a great measure, lost sight of : and with the objector and many others, is taken very little notice of, if they can only be saved from eternal punishment.

But the objector says further, "Look at the loose principles, and still more loose morals, of the Universalists, and adds, by way of triumph, whoever heard of a revival of religion among them ?" As to the first part of this charge, we think enough has already been said, showing, that persons who understand the true principles on which the doctrine of Universal salvation is founded in Scripture, can neither be licentious in their principles nor morals. Such Universalists are no more

accountable for the licentious principles and practice of all those who style themselves Universalists, than Calvinists, Methodists, Baptists, are, for similar characters among them. The very same charge has been brought against other denominations : and at the present time, is urged with great zeal against the Unitarians, and indeed all who are not orthodox.

As to the charge of *loose principles*, we observe that this is a very loose way of speaking ; for we may call any principles loose which do not exactly accord with our own. This is the kind of shot, every party fire in their turn at each other, when they have nothing better at hand. Before we can determine any principles to be loose, we must first settle, what are true scriptural principles. The standard must first be established, before we can determine the principles which deviate from it. The principles of our Lord and his apostles, were counted loose by the Jews. Besides ; do we not find that every thing which does not accord with the popular creeds of the day, branded with this same mark, for party purposes ? At the Reformation, the principles of the reformers were counted loose by the Romish church ; but these very loose principles which they advocated, are certainly a blessing to us in the present day. Indeed, what man since their day, who ever attempted to state any thing from his Bible, contrary to the popular belief, but has been obliged to submit to the same kind of scorn and obloquy ? Some of the principles advanced by those calling themselves the orthodox, would have been deemed not only loose but also *heretical*, by the persons whose names are the objects of veneration to the different sects of the day. Calvin, would not now own many of those who call themselves Calvinists, because their principles have become so *loose*, differ so much from his. And we doubt, if Hopkins would not disown many who call themselves Hopkinsians. Yea, Mr, John Wesley, if he was to rear his head from the

tomb, would remonstrate, with the Methodists, that they have become loose in their principles, in not following up the system which he left them. And it is a notorious fact, that there is a falling off, in almost every sect, from the rigid systems which were originally given them by their respective founders. All sects of professed Christians have corrupted their way upon the earth, and are more loose in their principles than they once were. What can be a more loose principle than this, compared with ancient orthodoxy, that *Jesus Christ made an atonement for the sins of the whole world*. Yet this loose principle, is now embraced by Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists, yea, by almost all sects of Christians. This *loose principle*, which formerly would have been considered *universal salvation in disguise*, is now advocated by the sects of the day, and what more loose principles they may yet adopt, it is not for me to say, or even conjecture. Such has been the rapid march of Scripture inquiry and investigation, that orthodoxy now, is a very different thing, from orthodoxy twenty years ago. And what orthodoxy will be twenty years hence, time must develop. If Calvin, was-alive, that which is now current orthodoxy, would be heterodoxy with him. He would disown it.

Connected with this loose principle, another is now advocated—that *the number which shall be sent to hell to be eternally miserable, will not be a greater proportion of the whole human race, than the persons executed in any country are to the whole community*. The man who should have broached such a loose principle as this, in former years, would have been burned as an heretic. We ask, how much more loose must those persons become in their principles, to be as loose as I am in mine? They have not many steps to take, to stand on my ground; indeed, they have got one foot on it already. If Jesus Christ made an atonement for the sins of the whole world, we really think that such per-

sons might let all the world be saved. Why deny him the glory of saving all for whom he died? Must he die in vain for a number, and must they suffer eternally for the very sins for which he made atonement or reconciliation? And if such persons, have reduced the number which are to be eternally miserable, to so few, why not let the Savior's triumph over sin and death be complete, in saving the whole? If my principles are loose, the principles of such persons are far removed from old, rigid orthodoxy. The fact is, that nothing is easier than to call certain principles *loose*. The question with every man ought to be, are they *true or false*? This suggests another—*what saith the Scriptures*? To them I have appealed, and by their decision I am willing to abide; and shall feel grateful to the man who will show me my error, by an appeal to the same authority. *The word of God correctly understood, is true orthodoxy*, and no man's principles ought to be condemned as *loose*, until it is shown that *this standard of truth* does not warrant such principles. It will be allowed that men have gone beyond the Bible, in *rigid* principles. This, present orthodoxy warrants me to assert. It is the duty of orthodox people to show, that my principles are more *loose* than the Bible.

To the second part of this charge, made with such an air of triumph,—“Who ever heard of a revival among the Universalists?” we shall now attempt a reply. As we do not wish to hurt the feelings of any who may differ from us about revivals of religion, we shall touch this point with as gentle a hand as possible.

1st, If preaching the doctrine of hell torments, produces revivals of religion, it is not to be expected that any revivals of this kind could be produced among Universalists, for they do not preach it. That the preaching of eternal torments in hell, is one of the principal causes which produce revivals of religion in the present day, will not be denied. None of the subjects

of such revivals, would be deemed genuine converts, unless they subscribed to this doctrine, and confessed they had seen themselves doomed to hell by God's word. Yea, some would even demand the confession of them, that they were willing to be damned, in order that they might be saved.

2d, There were no revivals, arising from this cause, produced by the prophets, by Christ, or his apostles; nor could they be produced, for they did not preach the doctrine of hell torments. We think no man will affirm, that any revival of religion was produced, or so much as attempted by preaching such a doctrine. They never used it as a means to alarm and frighten people into a profession of religion. They were never found running from house to house, terrifying men, women, and children, by the most frightful descriptions of hell torments, until the whole community was in a religious ferment, and a reaction must take place, from the mere want of being able to carry the excitement any farther. Nor do we find in those days, what is too obvious in these, the different sects all exerting themselves in every possible way, to secure the greatest number of converts to their different churches. A man must shut his eyes very close, who does not see through all this religious manœuvring.

3c, Deducting, then, all the religion produced by the preaching of endless misery, which appears in religious excitements, how much would be left with the subjects of it? Such people's minds, are lashed with the terrors of hell torments into religion, or something that passes for it, and the fear of this punishment in a greater or less degree, operates upon them all the days of their lives. Should we hear of revivals among such persons, any more than among Universalists, if this false doctrine, the chief cause of their production, was done away? We question this; for, as far as our observation has extended, the doctrine of hell torments has



been a constant theme in public preaching, and in private meetings, to work on the minds of the people. This has been done with children, and others of weak minds, in a way, and to an extent, which men of common sense and prudence, ought to avoid. But, let us consider what the Scriptural idea of a revival of religion is, and by what means it is produced. The Scriptural idea of a revival of religion, may be viewed in a twofold light.

1st, When true religion is revived among those who are already professors of it; when they are stirred up to be more obedient to God, and lively in obeying his commandments, and observing the ordinances which he has appointed in his word. 2d, When persons, formerly irreligious, are convinced of their sins, believe the gospel of Christ, and turn to the Lord. I presume no person, yea, the most zealous contenders for revivals of religion, would object to this statement.

Let us then consider, how Scriptural revivals of religion were produced. It will perhaps, be the best way here, to refer to some examples of revivals of religion mentioned in Scripture. The first I refer to is, that which took place in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, seen at large in the two books in Scripture of these names. What then produced this revival of religion in those days? Was it by means of Ezra, Nehemiah, or any other person, preaching the eternity of hell torments? Was it by working on the passions, and alarming the fears of people, by every effort which they could make, to overwhelm their understandings with terror? No man will say this, who has ever read those two books. How then was this revival of religion brought about? It was by reading the Bible, and pointing out to the people, how far they had departed from what God had commanded in his word, and showing them that all their sufferings originated in this departure from God. This statement of the means, by which this revival was produced,

no one will dispute. Nor can the man be found, who will venture to assert, that preaching hell torments to the wicked had any share in effecting it. We should rejoice to see a revival of religion, among all professors of religion in the present day, produced by studying the Scriptures, to see how far they have departed from the law of the Lord. We trust we should not be wanting, in giving it all the aid in our power. I pass over attempts made by Jeremiah, and other servants of the Lord, to produce revivals of a similar nature among the Jews, but without success. I only observe in passing, that they used similar means to effect it, as did Ezra and Nehemiah. But when those means failed, they did not betake themselves to the means, so efficacious in our day, to work on the passions of men, by preaching the doctrine of hell torments, to effect their purpose.

A second instance of a revival of religion mentioned in Scripture, is that in the days of John the Baptist. Was it produced by preaching hell torments? No. John never used the word hell in all his preaching to the people. It was produced by preaching repentance, and pointing them to the Lamb of God, who was to take away the sin of the world. But the most extraordinary revival of religion, is that which took place at the day of Pentecost, and during the ministry of the apostles. Now, let all read the Acts of the apostles, and see if they can find, that any one of the apostles ever said a word about hell, or its eternal torments to produce this revival. Peter, on the day of Pentecost, is as silent on the subject of hell torments, as if no such thing existed in the universe of God. He addressed the very men, who had been the betrayers and murderers of the Lord of glory, but did he threaten them with the torments of hell, or enforce his doctrine by saying they were exposed to such a place of punishment? And is not all the preaching of the apostles uniformly the same in regard to this subject? No working on the passions ;

no attempt was made to terrify people into religion. One might with as much truth affirm, that an eruption of mount Vesuvius produced this revival, as that it was effected by preaching endless misery in hell! Let men only preach as the apostles did, by declaring the glad tidings of forgiveness of sins through Jesus Christ, and many things which go by the name of revivals of religion would be at an end. As the means of revivals in our day, are very different from those used by the apostles, so are the revivals produced by such means. The converts made, instead of partaking of the meek, humble, and gentle spirit of Christ, become censorious, bigoted, and dogmatical; and with reluctance will they admit, that persons, who certainly give as much evidence as themselves of Christianity, can really be Christians. They get attached to their minister, and to their sect, and zeal for these, is often mistaken for a zeal for God and his glory. Strong excitement of the animal passions, sometimes even to extravagance, is ascribed to the power of God, at work among the people. As to understanding, and believing the gospel of the grace of God, little is said, and as little perhaps, is it cared about. We think we may say to such persons, in their own language, "who ever heard of such kind of revivals of religion among the apostles and primitive Christians, or who ever heard of their producing any kind of revival whatever by terrifying people with fearful descriptions of eternal misery?" The course which the apostles pursued was open, manly, and dignified; and the doctrine they preached was glad tidings of great joy to all people. Their object, was not to save men from Gehenna or hell, but from ignorance, idolatry, licentiousness, and unbelief, and to instruct them in the knowledge and obedience of the one living and true God. But, the primary object of preaching in the present day, seems to be to save men from hell; to attach converts to some religious party, and enjoin on them to believe

neither more nor less, all the days of their lives, than is contained in the creed, which they subscribed to on their admission.

No one will certainly construe what is said in the foregoing remarks, into a disapprobation of revivals *generally*; but only of *such* as are produced by terror. We maintain, yea, we advocate true Scriptural revivals of religion. We know of nothing which could afford us more heartfelt joy, than to see all parties in religion, yea, all mankind, attending to the oracles of God, and sincerely searching them to know and obey all that the Lord hath commanded. In our remarks, we have considered terror the principal means in producing revivals in the present day; and to *such*, and *such only*, the preceding observations are intended to apply. Divest modern orthodoxy, of this most powerful engine for producing religious excitements, and henceforth it would probably have as few to boast of, as Universalism itself. We know not, why the truth of God preached by Universalists, should not produce a Scriptural revival of religion, equally as when preached by others. Is it the particular *medium* or *manner* of communication, that is to give the word of God effect? Or is the power of the Lord exclusively confined to a certain class of preachers? It is now as it was in the days of the apostles, the Lord *bears testimony to his own word*, Paul might plant, and Apollos might water, but it was God who gave the increase. But if our memory has not deceived us, we have seen printed rules for bringing about revivals of religion, and some *preachers* have not hesitated to say, that it was the people's own fault that they had not revivals among them. Yea, some have determined before hand, that they would get up a revival, and have gone to work in their own way and accomplished it. All this we really think is without precedent or example in the history of apostolic preaching.

It is objected,—“ *That this doctrine is a very pleasing doctrine to the world.*” In reply to this objection, I would observe, 1st, That the first question to be settled is this ; *is it a true or false doctrine ?* The Bible must decide this, and to it we have appealed. Of what use can it be in determining whether a doctrine be true or false, to call it either pleasant or unpleasant ? To admit the truth of what is here asserted, what could it prove against the doctrine ; and to deny it, what could it prove either for or against it ? Such kind of arguments, are generally used by such as have nothing better to urge ; yea, are too indifferent about what is truth, to give themselves the trouble to investigate the subject. To ascertain the truth of any doctrine, we have only, according to this objection, to find out if it is pleasant or unpleasant. If it is pleasant, it must be false, and if unpleasant, it must be true. This mode of decision saves a great deal of time and labor in reading and investigation ; for who would put themselves to the trouble of these, when a decision can be made by so short and easy a process ?

2d, I might in my turn say, the opposite doctrine is a very *harsh* doctrine. Perhaps, there is more force in this objection against it, than in the one against my views. If they must be false, because they are pleasant, does it follow, that the opposite doctrine is true, because it is harsh ? We should think it rather an argument against its truth. That the objector’s doctrine is not a harsh doctrine he has got to prove. The very saying, that my doctrine is pleasant, implies, that he is sensible his own is harsh. We presume many have thought it so, who have been afraid to speak freely their minds on the subject. Yea, we doubt if any man can seriously meditate on the doctrine of eternal misery, and say it is pleasant. Influenced by religious prejudices, and overawed by public opinion, persons assent to it, but do not feel convinced in their judgments of



its truth. When they begin to reflect seriously on the eternity of hell torments, and compare it with the well known character of God, as a God of goodness, mercy, and truth, the mind is at a stand what conclusion to come to concerning it. They think the Bible teaches it, and therefore they must believe it, but with the character of God they are unable to reconcile it.

3d, The gospel of the grace of God is a very pleasing doctrine, and if the objection has any force against my views, it equally lies against it. The objector then has pleasing doctrines as well as the one I have been stating, against which he cannot make his objection to bear. But why is this the case, for if the pleasant nature of any doctrine proves it false, why believe the gospel of God to be truth?—It is certainly a very pleasing doctrine to hear, that there is a *possibility* that any of the human race will be saved. It is still more pleasing that there is a *probability* that a great number of them will be saved. And we are at a loss to know, why it should not be still more pleasing, if it can be proved, that *all the human race will certainly be saved*. But while the two first of these will be admitted as pleasant, and this is no argument against their truth, yet the last is considered false, because it is the most pleasant. Does the objector say, we know the two first are true, but not the last. This is the very point at issue to be proved, and the proof must be drawn from some other source, showing the falsehood of my doctrine, than the pleasing nature of it.

4th, If the pleasant nature of the doctrine, be a solid objection against its truth, the fewer saved the better, to prove the doctrine false, and the more agreeable, I presume, to the objector. We think, we may go further, and say, that the eternal misery of the whole human race, which would be precisely the reverse of my doctrine, is most likely to be the true one, according to this objection. Its being harsh or unpleasant, then,

shows it to be true ; and because it is so unpleasant, this is the strongest evidence that it must be true. The fact is, there is no real argument in the case before us. A false mode of reasoning is adopted, and the world might end, before any thing conclusive could be made out by it on this subject.

5th, The objector seems to think, that my doctrine is pleasing, and the force of his objection arises, from thinking, that all are to be saved without a salvation from sin. This is his mistake, not mine. Should he say, this is the inference that many will draw from it, to go on in sin ; I reply, I cannot help this, any more than the objector can, when persons draw inferences from his doctrine, to go on in the same course. Yea, I cannot help this, any more than an apostle could, when persons drew the inference from his doctrine, “let us sin because grace aboundeth.” What doctrine is it from which men may not draw inferences to go on in sin ? The only one that I can at present think of, is the doctrine of universal, eternal misery. Even this is not an exception, for the inference would be, “since at death we are all to be eternally miserable,—let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.” If some have argued,—“let us sin because grace aboundeth,” perhaps others have also said,—“let us sin because eternal torments aboundeth.”

6th, Is it not God’s design that the gospel of his grace should be a pleasing doctrine to the world ? It is glad tidings of great joy to all people. We ask, does God mean to save the world by the preaching of *an unpleasant doctrine* ? If so, we know of none better fitted to effect this, than the doctrine of eternal torments in hell. Had the apostles preached this doctrine, just as much as preachers do in our day, we should have been inclined to believe, that God meant to save men by the preaching of this very doctrine. But will any man affirm, that their preaching has any affinity to many

sermons we hear in our day? The word Gehenna or hell, none of their hearers ever heard them utter, if the New Testament is to be our Bible. But the word *hell*, is now on the lips of all preachers, who believe this doctrine, so frequently, that one would think, if they learned their divinity from the Bible, that it was full of it. The apostles never used this word in any sermon, but *they* seldom omit it. Whether my views be right or wrong, it is certain, it was not God's design to save men in the apostle's day by preaching hell torments to them, for this they never did: and it is also very certain, that my views are more like those entertained by the apostles, than the sentiments taught by orthodox preachers. I put in therefore my claim, for being more orthodox than they are, if apostolic preaching is a true standard of orthodoxy. I may add, what seems also certain, that if it be God's design now to save men by preaching the doctrine of eternal misery, he has changed his mind, for this was not his design in the days of the apostles.

7th, If the objector is sincere in urging this objection, that because the doctrine is pleasant it cannot be true, does it not fairly follow, that the more unpleasant any doctrine is, the more certain is its truth? Upon this principle no doctrine ought to be more surely believed than the doctrine of eternal misery, for surely it is not a pleasant doctrine. All Universalists therefore, ought at least to believe the objector's doctrine because it is so unpleasant to them. But on the other hand, the objector ought to believe their doctrine and for the very same reason, because their doctrine is unpleasant to him. By this mode of deciding what is truth, both doctrines are proved true, and the two ought to believe each other's doctrine, and reject their own. But when they have done this, they must just reject the new doctrines they have embraced, and receive their former ones for the very same reason; for the doctrines

they have embraced respectively are pleasant, and those they now oppose are unpleasant. In short, it proves both doctrines true and both false at the same time.

8th, But we may ask the objector, is it possible for any man to receive any doctrine until it *appears* pleasant to him? We think this is impossible. A doctrine may appear very unpleasant, and while it does so to any person, he will reject it. This we have a very good example of in the objector himself. The idea that hell is not a place of endless misery appears to him an unpleasant doctrine, and hence he rejects it. And the doctrine of eternal misery, on the other hand, appears at least to him a very pleasant doctrine, and consequently he receives it. Yea, let the objector try, to receive any doctrine until it appears pleasant. The doctrine of endless misery he has received, and we think it must appear to him pleasant, whatever it may be to other people. We think he ought not to deny this, and sure we are, that we shall never envy him any part of the pleasure which it affords him, until we have altered our minds greatly on this subject.

9th, If my doctrine be so pleasant as the objector says, how comes it to pass that it is not universally received? Why is it even so much opposed? So far from its being a pleasing doctrine to the majority, it is one which is generally condemned. All sects are agreed to put it down, if possible. There is something then in the doctrine, which renders it unpleasant. What this is, it is not difficult to perceive. This doctrine, certainly bears hard against the pride and self-righteousness of the human heart. It affords no room for one man to glory over another, as a particular favorite of heaven. Some, yea many, murmur against the good man of the house, that every man should have a penny; and like the elder son in the parable, are angry that the father should treat prodigals with such

kindness. They think there should be a *hell* to punish sinners in forever, and some have even gone so far as to say, if all men are to go to heaven, they do not wish to go there. So long as such a spirit prevails, there need be no wonder that my views of this subject should be hated and opposed. The first thing such persons ought to do, is to consider the nature of their spirit. Can such a spirit be the spirit of Christ?

It is further objected, "*that this is a very good doctrine to live by, but it will not do to die by.*"—In answer to this objector, let it be remarked, that this objection implies, that the doctrine of eternal misery, is a doctrine which will do, both to live and die by. But that my doctrine, can afford no hope or comfort, either in life or in death. Or does he mean, that his doctrine affords more of these, both in life and in death; but that mine only affords a false and temporary hope, and comfort in life, but no hope nor comfort in death? Taking this to be the true sense of the words of the objector, we would then ask him, how he knows that his doctrine will do better to live and die by, than mine? We do not think he can make any possible reply to this, but by saying, *my doctrine is true and yours is false.* Well, whoever urges this objection, will consider it a duty they ought to perform, to prove that my views are unscriptural. For

1st, If they are *true*, why will they not do to live and die by better than the opposite views, which must be *false*? The whole here depends on the truth or falsehood of my sentiments. *If they can be proved from the Scriptures false, I frankly confess that they are neither fit to live nor die by.* Candor, in the objector, will certainly also grant, that if my sentiments are true, *his doctrine of eternal torments in hell, is not fit either to live or die by, because it must be false.* I contend, that true doctrine, or in other words, the doctrine of the Bible, is the doctrine which men can either



live or die by comfortably. Error, is not good for men, either in life or in death. It is *truth* which gives true hope and joy to the mind, and it is *truth*, which is a light to the feet and lamp to the path. The whole here depends on which of the two doctrines is the doctrine of Scripture. While this remains undecided, I have as good a right to say to the objector as he has to me, your doctrine is a very good doctrine to live by, but it will not do to die by. Until the objector fairly meets the arguments, by which I prove Gehenna or hell, is not a place of endless misery for the wicked, I might dismiss this and other objections of a similar nature. But

2d, The objector must allow, that if his doctrine is so good to die by, it is not very good to live by. He certainly cannot deny, that the doctrine of eternal torments in hell, has given much distress to many, and many too, whom he would not deny to be the excellent of the earth. We think, it does not give one half the distress to the thoughtless and licentious, as it does to the more thinking, serious, and exemplary part of the community. The former laugh, dance, and play, and drive away all their fears of the punishment of hell torments. The doctrine, only gives distress and misery of mind to the most valuable part of society. These, and these almost exclusively, are the persons who are rendered miserable all their life-time by this doctrine. We think the objector will not deny, that many instances have occurred, where persons of thinking and serious habits, have been driven to distraction, and even to suicide by it. But was a case ever known, where a person was distressed in his mind, went deranged, or ended his days, because hell *was not* a place of eternal torment for a great part of the human race? We have found a few, who would be very sorry, if my views could be proved true. This we have imputed to want of consideration, and a false zeal for a favorite doctrine,

but we are under no apprehension, that if they are found true, they will carry their zeal so far as to end their days in consequence of it. Is not my doctrine then better to live by, than that of the objector?

3d, But if my views are such as may do to live by, but will not do to die by, how came it to pass, that persons could both live and die by them under the Old Testament dispensation? It was not known in those days, that Gehenna was a place of eternal misery for the wicked, yet many lived happy, and died happy. It does not appear, from any thing I have ever noticed in the Old Testament, that persons then derived any hope or consolation, either in life or in death, from the doctrine of eternal torment; nor, that it was any motive in producing obedience to God's commandments. We find no holy man of God in those days, urging the doctrine of endless misery on mankind, as a good doctrine to live and die by, and warning men against the opposite doctrine, as a dangerous error. Besides, how could the apostles and first Christians, either live happy or die happy, seeing they knew nothing about hell as a place of endless misery? They knew nothing of this doctrine; therefore let the objector account for it, why my doctrine will not do to live and die by now, as well as in the days of the apostles. What would the objector have done for this doctrine to live and die by, had he lived eighteen hundred years ago? He cannot say, that the apostles ever preached the doctrine of hell torments for any purpose; and far less that they preached it, as a good doctrine to live and die by.

4th, But let us examine a little more particularly, what there is in the doctrine of hell torments, which is so much better fitted to live and die by, than the sentiments which I have stated in the foregoing pages. The objection we are considering, is often used, and serves some on all occasions, when argument fails, in defending the doctrine of hell torments. When hardly

pinched to defend it, from Scripture, they cut the matter short, thus,—“Ah! your doctrine may do very well to live by, but it will never do to die by.” This, perhaps, uttered with a sigh or a groan, answers in place of a thousand arguments with many. I shall therefore give it more attention, than it deserves. Let us then

Consider the comparative merits of the two opposite doctrines to *live by*. The doctrine, or *my doctrine*, that hell is not a place of eternal torment for all the wicked is *barely allowed* to be a doctrine, which men may *possibly live by* in the present world. Now, how Adam, Noah, Abraham, Lot, and others, made out to live by it, I do not stop to inquire. I leave my opponents to inquire, how they, and the apostles, and first Christians, yea, I may add Jesus Christ himself, succeeded in living so well by it. When they have found out this, I can be at no loss to tell them, how I and others can live by it. But we pass over this, and wish to bring the comparative merits of the two doctrines into notice, as best fitted to live and die by.

1st, Then, let us attend to the fitness of the doctrine of eternal misery, to live by. If it indeed be better fitted for this purpose, it must be in the following things. 1st, As a ground of hope in respect to future happiness. But, how any man can make the eternal torment of others in hell, a ground of hope to himself I am unable to devise. If the eternal misery of one human being, affords the objector any ground of hope, the more doomed to this punishment then, so much greater the extent and solidity of his ground of hope. But as this is not likely to be the ground on which this is placed, I observe

2d, Does it afford a more certain and sweet source of joy in this world, than the opposite doctrine? A man's joy must arise from his hope whether it is well or ill founded. If, then, the doctrine affords no ground of hope, it can be no source of joy to him. Besides;

we have always thought, that Jesus Christ and him crucified, was the foundation of true hope, and the source of true joy to people in this world. We never understood, that the certainty of endless misery, was set forth in Scripture as the ground of our hope, or the source of our joy. The apostle, Gal. ii. 26. says : "The life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." But, did the apostle ever say, that the life he now lived in the flesh, he lived by the faith that hell was a place of endless misery, either as a ground of his hope or source of his joy ? Or did he ever say, that Christ loved him and gave himself for him, to save him from the punishment of this place ? He joyed in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, but I do not find that hell torments were a source of joy, either to him or to any one else. It could not be so : for none of the apostles ever spoke of hell as a place of endless misery. We then ask, how this doctrine can be to any a better doctrine to live by than mine ? We ask further, in what way is it better fitted to live by than mine, if the persons who profess it, derive neither hope nor joy from it ? I ought to allow, perhaps that it does afford a selfish joy to some, that they are secure from the torments of hell, while multitudes are doomed to suffer its punishment forever. This we presume, is all the joy which this doctrine affords, and we ought to call it any thing but Christian joy. But why the doctrine of eternal torments, is better fitted to live by than mine, probably is,

3d, That it is considered a better preservative against a licentious life, and a more powerful motive to holiness. This, I presume, is the ground on which the doctrine of eternal misery is counted the best of the two to live by. Is this then true ? We think we have said enough in answering the first objection, to prove that it is not. We shall however add the following remarks here, to show that it cannot be true. We ask, then,—Is *love*

or *terror* the most powerful principle to stimulate to a cordial and universal obedience? Let both Scripture and every day's experience decide in this case. Will any man affirm, that the obedience required of us in Scripture is there held forth, as an obedience induced by the terror of hell torments? No; it is the obedience of gratitude and love. Terror, may frighten men to comply with many things to which their hearts are totally averse. It is love which sweetly constrains, not only to external obedience, but to the obedience of the heart and affections. But what does experience and daily observation teach concerning this? Who, that is acquainted with the history of the world, or with human nature, will say, that terror of the most horrid punishment, has been found efficacious in producing a cordial obedience in any department of human society? So much are legislators and others convinced to the contrary, that many nations are altering their code of laws, respecting the severity of human punishments. We then ask, in what respect the doctrine of eternal misery, is better fitted to live by than my doctrine, if it affords no hope nor joy to those who believe it, and is not a proper inducement to a holy life in the world? Let the objector point out, if he can, its preferable nature, and show wherein it consists. My doctrine is, that God never threatened men with eternal torments in hell; that he never made any such revelation to the world, but sent his Son to make reconciliation for transgressors, and to save them from their sins. That this doctrine is better fitted to live by, as to hope, joy, and obedience, we should deem it a waste of time to point out. My doctrine as to these things, compared with its opposite, is like noon day, to the gloom of midnight. We think, it will not be disputed, that if my sentiments are Scriptural, all anxious fears about eternal misery are at once removed; a foundation of hope and source of joy to men laid open, which are calculated to animate and con-



sole the mind under every trouble of this world ; and motives to gratitude and obedience to God presented ; which the doctrine of eternal misery certainly does not afford. No, on the other hand, it fills the mind with gloom and anxiety ; it leads to views of God not very favorable to his character ; and is not calculated to make men love and serve him. We may indeed hope in his mercy revealed in the gospel through Jesus Christ, and may have joy in believing that we shall escape the torments of hell. But that the best of men are still haunted with fears and anxieties, notwithstanding this, will not be denied. That this has been their state of mind, in regard to their own personal safety from hell, is what we might expect ; but they have been also perplexed and distressed, as we think every good man must be, about the eternal condition of all their fellow creatures. We pity the man, who, if he thinks himself safe from this place of torment, feels no concern for the unnumbered millions of men all equally interested in the decision of this important question.

Let us now consider, how the doctrine of eternal misery, is better fitted than my sentiments, to die by. It must, be better to die by than mine.

1st, As a ground of hope in death. But we ask, what ground of hope it can afford to any man at death, to think that the doctrine of eternal misery is true ? Can he look on his wicked wife, and still more wicked children, and neighbors, in the hour of death, and make their eternal misery a foundation of hope for his own eternal blessedness ? Can the certainty of their eternal misery, afford him any *hope of safety* ? Can he die with a more joyful hope because their misery is to have no end ?

2d, As a source of joy and consolation in death. But to which of the saints of old shall we refer, to find that the doctrine of endless misery, was any source of joy to them, when about to leave this world ? Can any

thing like this be found in all the book of God? What name ought even a joy of this kind to receive, if it was possessed? But we do not think, this doctrine affords any joy in death to a person dying, either concerning himself or those he is about to leave. We rather think, that the doctrine at this hour, is often to the believers of it themselves, rather a source of pain and uneasiness. Should their hopes of heaven, be such as to banish all fear for themselves, it often proves a source of misery to them, in regard to the friends and relations they leave behind. This, we think, will no be disputed. Now, allowing that my doctrine is true and the objector's false, how different would be the state of mind in which men would bid a last adieu to friends and relations, yea, to all the world. Such separations are often heart rending scenes. My doctrine, at this time gives hope, is a healing balm, for it is only a momentary, not an *eternal* separation. But the opposite doctrine adds pungency to every parting pang, and the only consolation it affords to the dying saint, with regard to many of his relatives, is, that he shall have the pleasure of viewing from heaven, their torments in hell forever. Let us suppose ourselves by the bed of a dying person, and hear him say, that he was full of hope and joy, arising from his belief in the eternity of hell torments; and that the torment of his relations, friends and neighbors, would give him pleasure in heaven. I ask, what would we think of such a person? It would certainly be charity to believe, that he was disordered in his mind. If we did not, we should conclude that some evil spirit possessed him, and that in this state of mind he was very unfit for heaven.

To conclude. We are either too blind, or too perverse, to perceive how the objector can prove, that his doctrine is a good doctrine, either to live or to die by. We should be glad to see it shown, if it can be done, how eternal misery in hell, can be to any man a good doctrine, in life, or at death; in time or in eternity.

It is a very popular objection, brought against my views of Gehenna,—“If you are correct, we must believe the most learned, and good men, yea, most Christians, for a great many ages, have been in a great error. Do you think yourself wiser than any of them?” In answer to this objection, let it be remarked

1st, That I make no pretensions to superior learning, wisdom, or goodness. I only profess to have paid some attention to the Scriptures on this particular point, which those persons, taking the subject for granted, have inadvertently overlooked. This all men are liable to. It will be granted, that no man is perfect in knowledge. And it will be seen, that those learned and good men from whom I differ, very unfortunately *took it for granted that Gehenna was a place of endless misery for all the wicked*. Had they not done this, but as I have attempted to do, examined into the truth of this doctrine, they would have given a very different account of Gehenna or hell, from what they have done. From their superior learning, talents, and means of information to which I have no access, they would have placed this subject in a much more luminous and convincing light. Were those very men alive, they would be the last men, who would blame me for my inquiry on this important subject.

2d, This objection, was urged at the Reformation against the reformers, and indeed may be urged against all reformation to the end of time. It will serve a Jew, a Mahometan, or a Pagan, as well as a Christian. If it has any weight against me in the present case, it is equally strong against every man, who advances any thing from his Bible, contrary to what learned and good men have believed in past ages. Those very men, whom I am blamed for differing from, were blamed in the same way, in dissenting, from learned, wise, and good men, who preceded them. They did not scruple to dissent from, or go beyond those who went before them,

and assigned their reasons for so doing. And why should not we do the same thing? If this is not done, knowledge would be perfectly stationary, and an end is put to advancement in Biblical knowledge. Had the reformers been frightened, with this and similar objections, we would now be all good Catholics, or perhaps idolaters, worshipping the works of our own hands.

3d, So long as such learned and good men are allowed to be fallible men, it must be admitted, that they may have been mistaken. We ought not to receive their opinions about Gehenna, or any other doctrine, without examination. We ought to bring them to the Bible for trial, and be satisfied, that they are not the mere opinions of men, but the faithful sayings of God. This I have done, with respect to the common opinion entertained about hell, and I request every man to try what I have advanced, by this infallible standard. If those men have been mistaken, it is certainly high time that the mistake was corrected. If they are correct, and the common opinion concerning hell be true, much good must result from the present discussion, in leading men to examine more carefully, the ground on which their faith is built. It will not be denied, that a great many who are believers in the doctrine of hell torments, have received this doctrine by tradition from their fathers, without any Scriptural examination of it for themselves.

4th, It is allowed, that those learned and good men, lived and died in many errors, and some who bring this very objection against me, take the liberty to dissent from their opinions in other things. Why may they not have erred in thinking that Gehenna was a place of endless misery; and why have not I as good a right to dissent from them in this, as some have done in other things? All we wish is, let the subject be impartially examined, and truth will be brought to light by the investigation. Can any Calvinist, Hopkinsian, Baptist,

or Methodist, urge such an objection with a good grace, when they all, each in their own way, dissent from the doctrines of so many learned, wise, and good men, who lived before them? Before they open their lips against me, let them return to the doctrines of their forefathers, and confess how greatly they have departed from the good old way. But each sect thinks, that their departure from the doctrines of their fathers, is a nearer approach to the doctrine of the Bible. This is just what we think concerning our departure from their views of hell or Gehenna. In proportion as we have receded from them, we think we have approached the truth in the Bible, concerning this subject.

If we are to believe, just as learned and good men have taught in past ages, many things now most surely believed, must be renounced, for men have very greatly departed from their views of many Scripture doctrines. You hear men every day call themselves Calvinists: but Calvinism now is a very different thing from what is found in the works of John Calvin. You also hear of orthodoxy, but orthodoxy is not the same now that it was twenty years ago, and what is true orthodoxy in America, would not be orthodoxy in Scotland. The truth is, men are beginning to search the Scripture for themselves, and are taking the liberty to dissent from their fathers, however learned, or good they may have been. The Reformation was the dawn of day, after the long night of ignorance and superstition. But were the reformers to rise from the tomb, they would be surprised to see some good, and wise, and learned men, contending that we must advance no farther, but must sit down satisfied where they left us. Happy for us, that we live in an age and in a part of the world, where it would not be in the power of man to stop the tide of inquiry and investigation.

Another popular objection against my views of Gehenna, is thus stated.—“Supposing, that the evidence



you have produced, showing that Gehenna is not a place of endless misery for the wicked, to be almost, if not altogether, conclusive, yet allowing a bare *possibility*, that the opposite doctrine may be true; those who believe it, though in an error, are still on the safest side. They can lose nothing if your doctrine be true, but you may lose both soul and body forever, if their doctrine is true." I have stated this objection with all the force I can give it. It is predicated on a mere *possibility*, that the doctrine of hell torments *may be true*, and that in face of evidence, allowed to be almost, if not altogether, conclusive, in proving the opposite doctrine true. We shall offer a few brief remarks in reply.

1st, If there be any force in this objection, it is certain we ought not to be regulated in our belief or disbelief of any doctrines, by the degree of evidence, which may appear in their support. No: this has nothing to do in leading us to believe one doctrine, and reject its opposite for want of evidence: for though it is allowed, that the evidence adduced is nearly conclusive that Gehenna is not a place of endless misery, yet all this evidence is nothing, and we must still go on believing that it is, on the mere *possibility* of its being true, unsupported by evidence.

2d, Whether my views of Gehenna or hell, or the commonly received doctrine about it, be the truth, one thing is certain; every Scriptural doctrine must have evidence to support it. Evidence is the criterion of truth; nor can a man be said to believe any doctrine, farther than he understands it, and perceives the evidence of its truth. Where the evidence, for or against any doctrine is equally balanced, the mind is in doubt, and suspense prevails, until some additional evidence appears, which leads the mind to preponderate to the one side or the other. This is the natural course of every candid mind, in serious search after what is truth. But here, though the evidence adduced that Gehenna

is not a place of endless misery, is allowed to be nearly conclusive, yet the mind must preponderate to the opposite side. It is not even allowed to hang in doubt, and suspend judgment until further evidence shall appear, but must come to the conclusion, that eternal misery is true, on the mere ground that after all it may possibly be true. The mind, must come to the very opposite conclusion of that to which the evidence leads. A mere possibility, thrown into the one scale, far outweighs all the evidence we have adduced, in the other. This is not the course a candid mind pursues in considering the comparative weight of evidence. If the importance of the subject, demands scrupulous care in coming to a decision, the evidence on both sides is subjected to a strict examination, and further evidence is eagerly sought after, to remove doubts and decide with certainty on the subject. But this is not the course we must pursue on this subject, if this objection is to be regarded. Should doubts remain, arising from lack of evidence, that my views of hell or Gehenna are true, or that the evidence which I have adduced is considerably weakened by the evidence on the other side, all I wish is, let the subject be more carefully examined. But I enter my protest, against shutting our eyes to the evidence which has been produced, and still profess to go on believing an old popular doctrine, upon the mere *possibility* that it may be true, without producing evidence on the other side. Had such a course been pursued, or had such objections as this and others been allowed at the Reformation, we had to-day been in darkness which might be felt.

3d, But the objector, in this objection, has reduced the subject of discussion to a mere profit and loss account, as to our different views of hell or Gehenna, and that on the *supposition*, that his views may *possibly* be true. Let us examine how this account stands.

1st, Then, let us attend to his side of this account.

It stands thus : The doctrine of eternal torment in hell, may *possibly*, after all, be true, and if true, in consequence of embracing this error, I may lose my soul and body forever. Such is the loss with which I am charged in his account. It is a loss which cannot be exceeded, by saying any man has lost more than this. It is certainly of such a nature, as no man who was not determined on his own everlasting misery would on any consideration run the least risk about. No language under heaven, has a word to express my folly and madness in avowing such sentiments, if they are not true. I certainly must then, have the credit of being a sincere believer of the sentiments I have advanced relative to this subject, whether true or false.

But how is this account proved against me to be true? I deny that the entry is true, or that the account of loss charged, can be proved. Is it the belief that hell is a place of endless misery, which *saves* any man? And is it unbelief in this doctrine which damns any man to this punishment? Here seems to be one radical mistake of the objector. He seems to think that if his doctrine is true, all who have not believed it, must suffer this punishment for not believing it. But if this was true, he would send all the ancient prophets and saints to hell. He would also send all the apostles and first Christians there, yea, the Savior himself, for he nor any of those persons, seem to have believed his doctrine. If their unbelief of it, does not involve such an awful and solemn loss to them, how can it to me? Placing me in such company, I shall not feel much alarmed; yea, he will be obliged to add to our company, all the Universalists, and all who have doubted of the truth of his doctrine and a multitude which no man can number, who have in their hearts disbelieved it, but who were not honest enough to avow their convictions. He perhaps may be obliged to add even himself, for a belief founded on a mere *possibility* that the thing believed, is true, is surely not far from unbelief concerning it.

But the objector labors under a mistaken notion as to *what saves*. According to him it is the belief of the doctrine, that hell is a place of endless misery. It is not the belief of this which saves men from hell or from any thing else. Jesus Christ is the Savior, and it is the gospel or glad tidings of God's grace or favor through him, that saves men from every thing they need to be saved from. Nor would the objector undertake to defend, that a man who believed the gospel, and showed his faith by his works, would be damned if he did not also believe the doctrine of endless misery in hell. Would he not pause a moment, before he, with one indiscriminating sweep, sent all to hell who have not believed his doctrine? This charge must then be cancelled from his side of this account against me. The objector may take his choice, either to do this, or with me to consign prophets, apostles, and innumerable others over to eternal misery.

2d, Let us now examine my side of this account against the objector. My loss is the loss of both soul and body forever, if his doctrine is at last found true. It is freely granted, that if my doctrine is true, that neither the objector nor any other man, loses soul and body forever. But because these are not lost, does it follow, that he loses nothing? We think that this is another very considerable mistake of the objector, which requires to be corrected in his account. Is it no loss to a man that he lives all his days, and at last dies in a very great error, though that error does not involve him at last in eternal misery? Is it no loss to him, that his error gives him very wrong views of God's character, and his designs by the salvation of his Son. Does it make no difference to him, as to profit or loss, to look on God as dooming a part, and by some the greater part of mankind, to inconceivable and endless misery, and being persuaded that God never threatened one of the children of men with such a punishment? Is it no

difference to him whether he spend his days in the certain and joyful hope of heavenly happiness, and that without any fears and anxieties about eternal misery, or live under fear and anxiety all the days of his life, and with fear and trembling, as to his future destiny, give up the ghost? And allowing him free from all such fears and anxieties as to his own future happiness, is it no loss to him to be denied the same hope and comfort of mind as to all his fellow creatures? In one word, does he suffer no loss by such wrong conceptions of God's character, which mar his own peace and comfort, and involve so many of his fellow mortals in endless misery? Such is a brief statement of the objector's losses. I leave the reader to enlarge it, which may easily be done to a much greater amount. Can he now say that he loses nothing, admitting my doctrine to be true, and his own to be false?\*

We now come to the second class of objections, *which are supposed to have some weight against the evidence adduced that Gehenna is not used to express a place of endless misery.* These we shall attempt to consider, without much regard to the order in which they are brought forward.

It has been objected, *that a very great change took place in the language of the Jews during the captivity in Babylon, and that it would be wrong to interpret words in the New Testament according to the sense which they have in the Old. It has been thought that during the captivity, the Hebrew language ceased to be vernacular among the Jews, and that they brought back from Babylon the Chaldaic instead of it.* This has been urged against the views we have given of Gehenna, and in favor of its meaning a place of endless misery. In reply to this, it ought to be noticed, that the

\* According to this objection, Universalists must go to hell, because their opinion of God's character is too good; and others go to heaven, because they believe him not so good a being, as Universalists.



supposed fact on which this objection is founded, is disputed by the learned. Mr. Parkhurst, in his *Lexicon*, on the word *Ebrais*, p. 181, thus writes :—" A strange notion originally derived from the Jewish rabbins, the descendants of those who crucified the Lord of Life hath prevailed, and is but too generally received, that, during the Babylonish captivity, the Hebrew language ceased to be vernacular among the Jews, and it is pretended that they brought back the Chaldee or Babylonish, instead of it ; and, in consequence, that the language commonly spoken in Judea in our Savior's time was not Hebrew, but Syriac, or Syro-Chaldaic. But

" 1st, Prejudice apart, is it probable that any people should lose their native language in a captivity of no longer than seventy years continuance ? (Comp. Ezra iii. 12, Hag. iii. 2. ) And is it not still less probable that a people so tenacious of their law as the Jews, should yet be so negligent of their language, wherein that law, both religious and civil was contained, as to suffer such a loss, and exchange their mother tongue for that of their detested and idolatrous enemies ; especially since they had been assured by the prophet Jeremiah, chap. xxv. 11, 12 ; xxvii. 22 ; xxix. 10. (comp. Dan. ix. 2,) that after a captivity of no more then seventy years they should be restored to their own land ? But

" 2dly, It appears from Scripture, that *under the captivity* the Jews retained not only their language, but their manner of writing it, or the form and fashion of their letters. Else, what meaneth Esth. viii. 9, where we read that the decree of Ahasuerus, or Artaxerxes Longimanus, was written unto every province according to the writing thereof, and unto every people after their language, *and to the Jews according to their writing and according to their language* ? (Comp. Esther i. Ezra iv. 7. ) And let it be remarked, that this decree was issued, according to Prideaux, Connect. part

i. book 5, *five years after* Ezra had obtained his commission for his return to Jerusalem with those of his nation, of which see Ezra vii.

“3dly, ‘Ezekiel, who prophesied during the captivity, to the Jews in Chaldea, wrote and published his prophecies in Hebrew.’ Leland’s *Reflections on lord Bolinbroke’s Letters*, p. 229, 3d edit. where see more.

“4thly, The prophets who flourished *soon after* the return of the Jews to their own country, namely Haggai and Zechariah, prophesied to them in Hebrew, and so did Malachi, who seems to have delivered his prophecy about an *hundred years* after that event. Now if Chaldee was the vernacular language of the Jews after the captivity, what tolerable reason can be assigned why those inspired men addressed not only the priests and great men, but also *the body of the people*, in Hebrew, and did not, as Daniel and Ezra have sometimes done, use the Chaldee language? It is I think, by no means sufficient to answer, with bishop Walton, that they did this because the rest of the sacred books were written in Hebrew; for if there were any force in this reason, it would prove that Daniel also and Ezra ought to have written in Hebrew *only*.

“5thly, Nehemiah, who was governor of the Jews about a *hundred years after* their return from Babylon, not only wrote his book in Hebrew, but in chap. xiii. 23, 24, complains that some of the Jews, during his absence, had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab, and that their children could not speak *ihurit the Jews’ language*, but spake a mixed tongue. Now *ihurit* is Hebrew, as it appears from *all* the other passages in which it occurs, *viz.* 2 Kings xviii. 26, 28. 2 Chron. xxxii. 18. Isai. xxxvi. 11, 13. But how impertinent is the remark, and how foolish the complaint of Nehemiah appears to be, that the *children of some Jews*, who had taken foreigners for wives, could not speak *pure Hebrew*, if *that* tongue had ceased to be vernacular

among the *people* in general *a hundred years* before that period? ‘So that (to use the words of the learned Spearman, to whom I am greatly indebted in the above observations,) *this very text* of Nehemiah, I think, refutes the received supposition of the Hebrew being lost in the Babylonish captivity.’

“6thly, It is highly absurd and unreasonable to suppose that the writers of the New Testament used the term Hebrew to signify a different language from that which the *Grecizing* Jews denoted by that name; but the language which those Jews called Hebrew after the Babylonish captivity, was not Syriac or Chaldee, but the same in which the law and the prophets were written. This appears from the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, which, according to Prideaux, was penned by the grandson of Jesus about 132 years before Christ; for he there observes, that ‘the same things uttered in Hebrew and translated into another tongue, have not the same force in them; and not only these things (this book of Ecclesiasticus) but the law itself, and the prophets, and the rest of the books have no small difference, when they are spoken *in their own language*.’

“Lastly, It may be worth adding, that Josephus who frequently uses the expressions *ten ebraion dialekten*, *glottan ten ebraion*, *ebraisti*, for *the language in which Moses wrote* (see inter. al. Ant. lib. i. cap. i. § 1, 2. comp. lib. x. cap. i. § 2. tells us, De Bell. lib. vi. cap. ii. § 1. that towards the conclusion of the siege of Jerusalem he addressed not only John, the commander of the Zealots, but *tois pollois*, *the (Jewish) multitude*, who were with him, *ebraizon in the Hebrew tongue*, which was therefore *the common language* of the Jews at that time, *i. e.* about forty years after our Savior’s death. Comp. Ant. lib. xviii. cap. vii. § 10.

“On the whole, I conclude that the Jews did not exchange the Hebrew for the Chaldee language at the captivity, and that the terms *Ebrais*, *Ebraikos*, *Ebraisti*,

in the New Testament, denote, not the Syriac, or Syro-Chaldaic, but the Hebrew language, commonly so called ; though I readily grant that this language, especially as it is spoken by the Galileans (See Mark xiv. 73. Math. xxvi. 73. and under *Galilaïos*,) had in our Savior's time deflected from its ancient purity, as particularly appears, I think, from the words *Abba*, *Akeldama*, *Boanerges*, *Gogotha*, which see in their proper places."

We give this just as we find it, and leave those who choose to investigate the subject to determine it. But in whatever way this point is determined, we are unable to perceive its bearing against the views we have advanced about Gehenna. Admitting that a great change took place in the language of the Jews during their captivity, if the Jews by this word, did not understand a place of eternal misery from their Scriptures before they went to Babylon, yet understood it so after they returned, it follows, that this *notion* was learned during the captivity. This is no honor to the doctrine, nor is it *authority* for a moment to be regarded. However great the change in the language of the Jews was during the captivity, we think it has been proved that our Lord uses the term Gehenna, in the sense it was used by the prophet Jeremiah, as an emblem of temporal calamities. Until this is disproved, and it is established, that this change in the Jewish language gave such a different sense to this word as the objector supposes, it does not deserve a serious consideration.

But though the idea of a place of future misery was learned by the Jews from the heathen, yet their giving it the name *Gehenna* was of a later date. This is evident from considering, that Nehemiah, Ezra, nor any Old Testament writer, after the captivity, ever spoke of this doctrine, or applied this word to it. The fact is, that whatever change, either the ideas or the language of the Jews underwent in Babylon, there is no proof to be derived from the Old Testament, that Gehenna was

changed in sense from being an emblem of temporal punishment, to being made an emblem of endless misery. We presume no person will pretend, that any proof can be produced of this. Let us then be informed upon what rational and Scriptural grounds, this term was so differently understood by the inspired writers of the New from those of the Old Testament. There must be a conscious lack of evidence, to urge the change which the Jewish language underwent in Babylon as any proof that our Lord used the term Gehenna to express a place of endless punishment for the wicked. It is rather exploding the doctrine than proving it, to have recourse to such means in establishing it.

It has been urged as an objection—*that though the Targums are not good authority to prove any doctrine, yet they are sufficient testimony to show, in what sense Gehenna was used among the Jews about our Savior's time, and it is evident from them, that it expressed a place of endless misery.* But this argument, is founded in the mistake, that the Targums were written before our Lord's day. We think this has been shown above. But supposing this was the sense of Gehenna, then, it is very evident the Jews could not understand it in this sense when they read the Old Testament Scriptures. How they understood it when they read the Scriptures is one thing, and how they used it in common discourse, and in making all the Gentiles fit fuel for the fire of hell, is another. If they gave it such an application, this is no proof that our Lord used it in the same manner. If they learned the notion, that Hades was a place of endless misery, among the heathen, and applied the term Gehenna to it, yea, consigned over all the Gentiles to its punishment, does this prove that our Lord either adopted this notion of theirs, or used Gehenna in this sense? That he should adopt this popular sense of the word, is far from being probable, and that he used it as Jeremiah had done, as an emblem of temporal punish-



ment, we think has been proved. Can any man reasonably believe, that our Lord used Gehenna in a sense seemingly invented out of enmity to the Gentiles, and laid aside its use in the Old Testament? Besides; and what ought to settle this question, the apostles so far from making the Gentiles or any others fit fuel for hell fire, never used the word in speaking to them, or about them.

It is further objected;—*admitting*, say some, *all that you have advanced about Gehenna or hell to be true, yet the doctrine of eternal misery to the wicked can be established from other parts of Scripture.* If this be true, many a man might have saved himself a great deal of labor, in writing and preaching, and many books on this subject are mere waste paper, for they are written expressly to establish the very contrary. If this ground is taken we shall be very happy, for it is greatly abridging the ground of debate on this subject. Am I then to understand, that all the texts which speak about Gehenna are abandoned, as not teaching the doctrine of endless misery? If they are, it is to be lamented, that they have been so long quoted as the principal proofs of this doctrine, and thus perverted from their true meaning. My labor at any rate, is not lost. If I am instrumental, in rescuing so many parts of God's word from such a misapplication of them, I shall have the consolation that I have not lived, or written in vain. A correct understanding of God's word, is to me the first thing in religion. There can be no real religion, in the perversion of that blessed book. If all such texts are relinquished as proof, we hope we shall hear no more about hell as a place of endless misery. Not only the texts, but the very word *hell* must be laid aside, as inapplicable to the subject. But if this is done we shall feel some impatience, until we learn by what other name it is called in Scripture.

It has been objected to my views—*that by Gehenna,*

*a STATE and not a PLACE of future endless punishment is intended, and that I have dwelt too much on the idea of its being a PLACE.* In reply to this we observe—1st, That before this objection is urged against me, such as hold to the doctrine of endless misery, ought to give up speaking of it as a *place* of punishment. It is always represented as a place, in writing, in preaching, and in conversation. Let the writer or the preacher be named, who does not speak of it as a *place* but as a *state*. Dr. Campbell, Edwards, and all other writers that I have ever seen or heard of, speak of it as a place. Yea, some have even pretended to tell where it is located, and have described also the nature of its punishment, and the wretched condition of its inhabitants in a very circumstantial manner. There can be no reasonable objection brought against my speaking of it as a place, until such persons give up this mode of speaking about it themselves. But if any uneasiness is felt, as if the doctrine was in danger, in speaking of hell as a *place* of endless punishment, we have no objection that they adopt the term *state*. Only let us fairly understand one another, and let them not blame me for speaking about it as they do themselves, until they have made this alteration.

2d, Supposing then the word *state* to be substituted for the word *place*, we ask, what advantage is gained in favor of the doctrine of endless misery? How does this new word shield it from what has been advanced against it? If it affords it any asylum, we confess our inability to perceive it. We are equally at a loss to perceive, how it invalidates a single fact or argument, which we have advanced, in proof that Gehenna or hell in the New Testament does not teach the doctrine of endless misery. If we are mistaken, let our mistake be pointed out.

3d, We should feel obliged to the persons, who wish to abandon the word *place*, to describe to us what they

mean by *state*, and endless punishment in this state, without any idea of *place*. We hope they will be kind enough to inform us also, why they wish to shift their ground from *place* to *state*, and whether this is coming nearer to the *Scripture mode of speaking of their doctrine*; or, is it with a view to *perplex the subject, and evade the arguments urged against it*? Men who would lay aside the good *old way* of speaking of *hell*, must have some reasons for doing this. We wish to know them.

4th, We have attempted to show, that Gehenna spoken of in the New Testament, is in reference to the same punishment, of which the prophet Jeremiah had spoken long before, concerning the Jewish nation. He had made Gehenna or the valley of Hinnom, an emblem of this punishment. In speaking therefore of Gehenna as a place, it was not my views which required this so much, as in opposing the common ideas entertained on this subject. This was rather a thing I could not avoid, than from any thing in my views which required such a mode of speaking in establishing them. Why then blame me for what they do themselves, and which their own views of this doctrine forces upon me in controverting them?

5th, It is allowed that heaven is a place as well as a state. Buck, in his Theological Dictionary, vol. 1. p. 330. says—“*Heaven is to be considered a place, as well as a state*; it is expressly so termed in Scripture. John xiv. 2, 3: and the existence of the body of Christ, and those of Enoch and Elijah, is a further proof of it. Yea, if it be not a place, where can those bodies be? And where will the bodies of the saints exist after the resurrection?” I appeal to all the world, if *hell* is not as generally spoken of as a place, as heaven is. And substituting the word *hell* for *heaven* in this quotation, the same things may be said of the wicked, as is said of the righteous. I only ask in the language

of this quotation—"Where will the bodies of the wicked exist after the resurrection, if hell be not a place? For all who believe this doctrine say they are to be raised.

6th, The popular views of Gehenna or hell, not only represent it as a place, but the Bible is thought to countenance this view of the subject. It is very certain, that the Scriptures do not mention hell as a *state*, and do not guard us against supposing it to be a *place*, as this objection would have us believe concerning it. All past orthodoxy, would denounce the man as heretical, who would insinuate that hell was not a *place*, but only a *state*. And must I now be condemned as heretical, for not speaking of hell as a *state* but as a *place*?

It has been objected—"that the words spoken by our Lord, Math. xxiii. 33. to the unbelieving Jews were prophetic, and that by the damnation of hell, he might simply mean some punishment after death, without any reference to the place or the nature of the punishment."

On this objection we remark

1st, That it has been shown in considering this passage above, that our Lord's words are not a prediction, but simply a threatening of temporal punishment to the Jews. But this objector takes it for granted that our Lord's words are prophetic. It is not assertions and suppositions, but proof that can avail any thing on this subject. If the objector says, that by the damnation of hell, our Lord might simply mean some punishment after death, without any reference to the place or the nature of the punishment, let him produce some evidence of this. We think, we have shown from this text and its context, that our Lord had no reference to a punishment after death, but to the temporal punishment coming on the Jewish nation. Let the objector disprove what we have said, and let him show from the context of this place, how his supposition can be supported from it.

We may *suppose* any thing ; but if unsupported by evidence, ought mere suppositions to be regarded ?

2d, If the objector can prove, that the punishment mentioned in this passage is after death, we really think that the place where it is to be suffered is called Gehenna, by our Lord. Why he should think the punishment to be after death, and yet have any difficulty as to its location, or the nature of the punishment, we cannot conceive. The context of this place, surely gives him no reason to conclude, that the punishment is after death, but the reverse. And if it does not determine also the nature of the punishment to be temporal, and that which was to come on the Jewish nation during that generation, it will be difficult to determine any thing from the Bible. If the punishment, of which our Lord spoke in this passage, be after death, it will not be difficult to show that every punishment mentioned in the Bible, is after death.

It is further objected—*if the mere silence of the Old Testament, concerning Gehenna being a place of endless misery, is of any force against it, will it not be of equal force against the doctrine of future existence, the resurrection of the dead, and many other things, which are not revealed in the Old Testament ?* In answer to this, we remark.

1st, That we have never laid much stress on the silence of the Old Testament, respecting Gehenna not being a place of endless misery. We have decidedly expressed our willingness to believe the doctrine, if it can be proved from either Testament. We have said, and we now say, that it is somewhat remarkable that such a doctrine as hell torments should not be taught in the Old Testament.

2d, The objector proceeds on the presumption, that future existence and the resurrection of the dead, were doctrines not revealed under the Old Testament. But this he has got to prove before his objection can invali-



date any thing which I have said, drawn from the silence of the Old Testament, to prove that Gehenna or hell is not a place of endless misery. If he proves, that a life of happiness after death, was unknown under the Old Testament, it is freely admitted, that my argument, drawn from its silence about future punishment, is destroyed. But if future happiness was known, and future eternal misery not known, how stands the argument? It is easily seen that it has considerable force, in favor of the views which I have advanced.

3d, That both future existence and the resurrection of the dead were in some degree known under the old dispensation, we think can be proved. Our Lord blamed the Jews for not inferring this from the words of God to Moses at the bush. Paul in the 11th of Hebrews shows, we think, decidedly, what was the faith of the ancient patriarchs about this. Though life and incorruption were brought to light by the gospel, yet, if this were the proper place, we think it could be shown, that it was not the *doctrine* but the *fact*, which was brought to light. But can the objector prove the contrary, and can he show, that the doctrine of hell torments was brought to light by the gospel? Unless he can do this, what I have said about the silence of the Old Testament respecting hell torments, remains unaffected by this objection.

It has been objected—*since paradise in the Old Testament merely referred to temporal happiness, but in the New is used for heavenly blessedness, why may not also Gehenna, used in the Old Testament for temporal misery, be used in the New for eternal punishment?* If the objector thinks so, let him show from the use of the words paradise and Gehenna, in the Old and New Testaments, that this is actually the case. To admit things at this *may be* rate, is nothing to the purpose, and especially on a subject of such importance as the one in question. Do we find a place of future eternal

happiness and a place of eternal misery equally and clearly revealed in Scripture? This is the first thing to be settled. Were both of these revealed, there would be nothing strange that paradise and Gehenna should be used by the inspired writers in speaking of them. But is this true, as it respects a place of eternal misery? No, we do not find, upon looking at all the places in the New Testament where the words paradise and Gehenna are used, that similar things are said of Gehenna as a place of future punishment after death, as is said of paradise as a place of happiness after death? Let our readers judge, if there be any affinity between paradise and Gehenna, and if these two words are used to express future eternal blessedness and misery alike, in Scripture. The objector takes it for granted, that paradise is used in the Old Testament. But in this he is mistaken, for the word does not occur there. Paradise is not even a Hebrew word, but is allowed to be Persian. Had the objector noticed, that this word is not used in the Old Testament, it might have prevented such an objection being made against my views. But as this objection is founded in a mistake, it did not deserve any consideration.

It has been also objected—*the reason why John said nothing about Gehenna was, that he was the beloved disciple: and the reason why all the apostles are silent about it is, they wished to save men by love, and not by the terror of hell torments.* This objection has some comfort in it, even if it does not convince us of our error. In reply, we may remark,

1st, If the reason, why John and the apostles said nothing about Gehenna or hell torments, was, as is asserted, because they wished to save men by love, it would seem to be the reason, why modern preachers preach hell torments, because they wish to save them by terror and not by love. How then does the objector account for, and is he prepared to defend, the difference

between apostolic and modern preaching? This objection agrees with my views so far, that God makes men obedient by love, and not by terror. So far well.

2d, It should seem from this objection, that the more we become apostolic, or like John, in love, this will lead us to say nothing about hell torments to others. If we can only like John, be beloved disciples, and be like the the apostles in our tempers and dispositions, we shall not mention endless misery in our preaching or conversation to the world around us, though we may be full in the belief, that they are all in the downward road to it. For

3d, This objection, notwithstanding all the love in John and the apostles, and their desire to save men by love and not by terror, supposed Gehenna or hell a place of endless misery for the wicked. The objection, proceeds on the supposition that John and all the apostles believed this, yet said nothing about it because they wished to save men by love rather than terror. If it is alleged, that in the places where our Lord used the term Gehenna, he meant a place of endless misery, John and all the apostles differed from him about this, for it seems he wished to save men, yea, even his own disciples by terror of hell torments. The objector seems to approve of their conduct, and thinks this was a lovely disposition in them; it showed love to the persons whom they addressed, in saying nothing to them about hell. Let no man say that this is love. What! John and the rest of the apostles, love men's souls, and believed them exposed to endless misery in hell yet never once mention their danger to them? All will agree with me in saying, that this is any thing but love or faithfulness to the souls of men.

It is further objected—if *Gehenna signifies wrath to come, it was natural to speak to Jews of endless misery by the former, and to Gentiles by the latter mode of expression.* Why it was natural to speak to Jews of

eternal misery by the one expression and to Gentiles by the other, we are not informed. But 1st, Allowing that this is the case, can it be proved that *Gehenna*, and the phrase *wrath to come*, are used in Scripture to express either to Jews or Gentiles endless punishment in a future state? We have shown that *Gehenna* is not so used in Scripture, and we think can show that the expression *wrath to come*, does not refer to a future state of existence. Wrath, yea, even the wrath of God, may be wrath to come, and yet be wholly confined to the present world. We think it will be difficult to prove that the wrath to come, mentioned in Scripture, had any reference to a state of punishment after death. 2d, Upon examination, we think it will be found, that the phrase, *wrath to come*, refers to temporal punishment, to Jews as well as Gentiles; but as the damnation or punishment of hell or *Gehenna*, had a particular reference to the temporal miseries of the Jews at the destruction of their city and temple, we never find it spoken of to the Gentiles.

It has also been objected—that if my views of *Gehenna* be correct, my interpretation of the passages where our Lord spoke to his disciples concerning it, go to show, that he was more concerned for their temporal safety than their eternal welfare. This objection, to some, will appear more plausible than many others which we have stated. But in answer to it, we remark 1st, That this objection assumes the question in debate, the whole of the present Inquiry being to prove, “that the eternal welfare of the disciples was not in danger.” This objection goes on the presumption, that the disciples were in danger of eternal misery, and that according to my interpretation of the passages in which our Lord spoke of *Gehenna*, he was more concerned about their temporal safety, than he was about their deliverance from eternal misery. The objector has then got to disprove the evidence I have adduced,

showing that Gehenna does not refer to a place of endless misery, and to establish his own views by evidence drawn from the New Testament that this is its meaning. 2d, That our Lord should be more concerned for the temporal safety of his disciples, than for that of the unbelieving Jews, many reasons might be assigned. They were his *disciples*, and their temporal safety could not be a matter of indifference to him. Their temporal safety also made manifest his character, in not destroying the righteous with the wicked. And was not this very sparing them, as a father spareth his only son that serveth him, a fulfilment of what God had spoken? See Mal. iii. 17, 18. and comp. chap. iv. But above all, was it not a matter of importance, that our Lord should show concern for the temporal safety of his disciples, as they were to be witnesses of his resurrection, and the heralds of his salvation to the ends of the earth? All these and other things which could be mentioned, account for our Lord's solicitude about the temporal safety of his disciples, without supposing that their souls were in danger of endless punishment in Gehenna.

It is further objected—*if there be no such thing as hell a place of misery in a future state, yet seeing it was believed both among Jews and Gentiles, that there was certainly such a place, why is it that neither Christ nor his apostles, ever took occasion to contradict this false notion, but on the contrary expressed themselves in appearance at least, so much in favor of this opinion, that a great part of mankind from that time to this have supposed it fully taught in the New Testament.* Some remarks are made in chap. i. sec. 3. which meet this objection. We offer a few additional remarks here in reply to it. 1st, Then we ask, how came they by such a belief. It was not from the Old Testament, for it is allowed that it does not teach such a doctrine. In chap. i. sect. 3. it has been shown, that the Jews learn-



ed this doctrine from their intercourse with the heathen. This made such a belief common to both Jews and Gentiles, and not that it was common to both, from divine revelation. 2d, But the point of this objection lies in the following things. It is asked,—“why is it that neither Christ nor his apostles, ever took occasion to contradict this false notion that hell was a place of misery?” In answer to this we ask in our turn—“If Christ and his apostles believed this doctrine common to both Jews and Gentiles, why did they not avail themselves of this universally received notion to inculcate and enforce this doctrine?” To have taught it, could have given no offence to either of them; yet we find them silent on the subject, that Gehenna or even Hades is such a place. The only exception to this, is the parable of the rich man, which has been shown not even to teach an intermediate state of punishment. If this popular belief then, was true, and believed to be so by the Savior and his apostles, why did they not avail themselves of it, and enforce it on both Jews and Gentiles? 3d, If we are to conclude, that because Christ and his apostles never expressly contradicted this false notion, common to both Jews and Gentiles, and that they by their silence sanctioned it as true, it follows, that all the false notions entertained by Jews and Gentiles not expressly contradicted by them are true. But we presume few would admit this, though it is a natural consequence from this objection. When any man will fairly make out, that their not contradicting expressly all the false, Jewish and heathen notions, is proof that those about which they are silent are true, we shall admit the one in question to be of the number. But another part of the point of this objection is, that—“on the contrary they expressed themselves, in appearance at least so much in favor of this opinion, that a great part of mankind from that time to this have supposed it fully taught in the New Testament.” In reply, we would ask in

what parts of the New Testament do we find this? Not surely from those parts which speak either of Hades or Gehenna. The places where our Lord used those words, have been considered, and we think it has been shown, that in none of them did he teach such a doctrine. His apostles never once named Gehenna, nor even intimate that either Hades or Gehenna referred to a place of endless misery. If our Lord and his apostles, did in appearance, speak of such a place of misery, some other texts must be referred to than those in which the words Hades and Gehenna are found. But it is supposed that Jesus Christ and his apostles expressed themselves in appearance, at least, so much in favor of this opinion, "that a great part of mankind from that time to this have supposed it fully taught in the New Testament." It will not be denied, that men from that time to this have supposed Christ and his apostles to teach doctrines, which they are now coming to be convinced are not taught in the Bible. That the one we have been considering is not of that number, ought not to be taken for granted. It is admitted by all, that a great many Jewish and heathen notions, were very early incorporated with the doctrine of Christ and his apostles. Past ages, have furnished but too much evidence, that the Scriptures have been used to countenance almost every opinion. Closer attention to the oracles of God has exploded many of them, and increased attention, may expose the falsehood of many more. That hell, a place of endless misery for the wicked, is an opinion which originated with the heathen we have shown above; and have also attempted to show, that those texts on which this doctrine has been founded, have been greatly misunderstood. If we have erred in interpreting them, let this be pointed out. Until this is done, and it is shown that the doctrine of hell torments did not originate in the heathenism, but in the authority of God, our views stand unshaken by this objection.

We find it also objected—*if there be no place of punishment in a future state, prepared for such as die in unbelief, how is this part of mankind to be disposed of after death, in what part of the universe is their abode to be assigned them?* Not in heaven; for God is represented in Scripture as bringing with him from thence at the resurrection of the dead, only those that “sleep in Jesus” and of all the dead only “the dead in Christ,” are said to ascend thither with him to dwell forever with the Lord. Not in Gehenna or hell; for according to your views, there is no such place in the world to come. On this objection let it be remarked—1st, Whatever abode we assign such persons in a future state, we think we have shown, that God does not assign to them as their abode, Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, or even Gehenna. If God has not assigned to them such a place, it is rash in us to assert this without his authority. If he should leave them without any abode either as to happiness or misery, there we ought to leave them. Dr. Campbell as we have seen, declares, that Hades is at last to be destroyed, and accordingly he assigns them an everlasting abode in Gehenna, but we think without any warrant from Scripture. If then we have proved, that hell or Gehenna is not the everlasting abode which God has assigned them, and seeing the objector thinks that heaven is not to be their abode, we ask him in turn how they are to be disposed of? If he denies that heaven is to be their abode, we think it has been shown that hell is not said to be their abode. If it is said, because they are not to go to heaven they *must* go to hell; we may reply, because they are not to go to hell they *must* go to heaven. 2d, The objection states that their abode is not to be in heaven, and the reasons assigned are—“For God is represented in Scripture as bringing with him from thence at the resurrection of the dead, only those that ‘sleep in Jesus;’ and of all the dead, only ‘the dead in Christ’ are said to ascend thither with

him to dwell forever with the Lord." This refers to 1 Thess. iv. 13. &c. on the whole of which passage I shall make the following remarks.

1st, The grand distinction in this passage, is between the dead and those found alive on the earth at the period referred to. The passage is alike silent how the wicked dead and those wicked found alive are to be disposed of; for not a word is said about the wicked. The persons said to be asleep or dead, verse 13. and those which sleep in Jesus, verse 14. and also as asleep, verse 15. and the dead in Christ who shall rise first, verse 16. all refer to the same persons. They refer to the dead, and we presume are exclusively confined by the objector to believers. On the other hand the *we*, who are said to be alive and remain, mentioned verses 15—17. must also be confined exclusively to believers, then found alive on the earth. These shall not prevent, or go before them who are asleep. Before they shall ascend, the dead in Christ shall rise first, and both shall ascend together to meet the Lord in the air. These last, we must confine to all living believers found on the earth, for if we extend it to all living, indiscriminately, why not the first also to all the dead indiscriminately? But if we take into view the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, and especially from verse 51—58. which seems to treat of the same subject, all the dead seems to be included. Compare also verses 20—22, 31, 35, 42—45.

2d. It is evident that the passage makes no distinction between two classes of people to be raised at this period, righteous and wicked. Either, then, this passage does not teach us anything concerning the wicked, or they are included with the others here mentioned. If they are not, and their resurrection is nowhere else spoken of, the inference would be that they are not raised at all. But in some other places their resurrection is asserted. See Acts xxiv. 15. If Paul

then in the passage, does not include all dead and alive, it is rather singular, that he should say nothing about the resurrection of the wicked, or how those left on the earth are to be disposed of, after all the others have left it to meet the Lord in the air. If he did not see meet to consign them over to hell forever, nor inform us how they are to be disposed of otherwise, the objector ought to prove, that hell is to be their everlasting abode. If I am mistaken in my views of Gehenna or hell, I wish to see my error pointed out. If it is to be their abode, I am in a great mistake. But if this passage is allowed to speak only of believers, yet there are others, which do not accord with what the objector seems to draw from it. According to this objection, none but such as died believers in Christ, are to be finally happy in heaven. This at once excludes all the heathen world, and a great part of what is called the Christian world. But how does all this agree with the promises of God, that in Christ all the families of the earth are to be blessed. That the heathen are given him for his inheritance, and the uttermost ends of the earth for his possession. That God hath reconciled all things to himself by Jesus Christ. That he is Lord of all, Lord both of the dead and of the living. That every knee shall bow to him and every tongue confess. But see among others the following passages which we think it will be difficult to reconcile with the objection urged from this passage. 1 Cor. xvi. 24—29. Rom. v. 12—21. Rev. v. 13. Philp. ii. 9—12. In short, how could it with any propriety be said, that the devil, the works of the devil, and death, the last enemy are all destroyed, if this objection is founded in truth?

But the whole force of this objection, seems to rest on the expression that is here used concerning the persons who are to be raised, that they *sleep in Jesus*. The term *sleep* is used for *death*, and we think it can be proved that it is so used concerning good and bad. It



is then the words *in Jesus*, on which the whole depends. Now we would ask, if even those who died in ignorance and unbelief concerning him, are persons for whom he died ; for whose sins he was a propitiation, and that he is not to give up the kingdom until all things are subdued ; yea, such persons are to be raised by him ; may it not be said that they sleep in him ?

But there is one thing in this passage which I would notice, and with it conclude my remarks on this objection. In verse 13. the apostle, addressing the Thessalonians, says—"I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them who are asleep, that ye sorrow not even as others who have no hope." Who were asleep, let me ask, and concerning whom the apostle wished them, "not to sorrow as those who have no hope?" According to the view taken in the objection they were only believers ; or believing relatives who had died. But why should they sorrow so much for them, and be told not to sorrow like the heathen, whose grief at the death of their relatives was excessive ? If we confine those who are represented as asleep, to believers only, it should seem that the Thessalonians had even little hope as to them, and went to excess in grief and needed to be cautioned against it. But if we consider the apostle as exhorting them against excessive grief at the death of their relations, who even died heathens, it not only obviates this difficulty, but their minds are consoled by the apostle in the passage concerning them. To understand it otherwise, would represent the Thessalonians as being grieved only at the death of their believing relations, and no way concerned for the future condition of such of them as died heathens.

Such are the objections, of any importance, which we have heard urged against the views which we have advanced concerning hell or Gehenna. Some of them, we frankly admit, are too trifling to have been noticed. After a consideration of them we must say, that not one

of them, nor all of them taken together, have even led us to suspect, that what we have said concerning hell, is contrary to Scripture. But let our readers consider them, and judge for themselves.

---

## SECTION VII.

### CONCLUDING REMARKS.

IF the sentiments advanced in the preceding pages, have been attended to by the reader, he no doubt perceives, that the conclusion which results from them is, that—*there is no place of endless misery taught in Scripture, as is commonly believed by most Christians.* This we admit to be the fair inference which results from what has been stated, unless it can be proved, that such a place of endless misery is revealed in Scripture under some other name than Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, or Gehenna. It is our deliberate and candid opinion, that these words are never used in Scripture to express such a place of misery. We have laid the evidence on which this opinion has been formed, before our readers, and they are left to judge for themselves, as to its truth or falsehood. Some, no doubt, will condemn what we have said, without giving the evidence produced a patient hearing. The popular, but senseless, cry of *heresy*, is sure to be rung in people's ears, to deter them from paying any attention to the subject. From such persons we expect nothing but noise and abuse, for they have no desire that their faith should stand in the wisdom of God. But there are others, whose good sense, judgment, and piety we respect, who, no doubt will will conclude, that my inquiry has ended in a great and fatal error. To all such I would offer a few remarks,

in vindication of myself, against this sentence of condemnation.

1st, Let those who thus condemn me, consider, if they do not take for granted, the grand question which has been under discussion. Do they not first determine in their own minds that *hell* is a place of endless misery, and because my investigation has not brought me to this conclusion, they conclude I must be in a great error? But why ought not such persons to admit, that they may be in an error on this subject; and instead of condemning me, ought to bring the subject to the Bible for examination? It is not our work to make a Bible, to alter it, nor bend it to support any sentiment, however popular in the religious world. It is a duty incumbent on every man, to study that precious book with serious care and attention, and by every just rule of interpretation, to ascertain, what is its true meaning. This I have attempted to do, and, unless I shut my eyes against evidence, and am determined to be an implicit believer in the doctrine of endless misery, to what other result could I come on this subject? If, after all the care and attention I have been able to give this subject, it can be proved that I am in an error, let this be done, and I pledge myself to renounce it. I have the testimony of my own conscience, that I have sought after the truth, and that without any regard either to the favor or the frown of my fellow creatures.

2d, But if we are not to examine into the truth of religious doctrines, unless our examinations end in the belief, that the popular and long established views of them are true, all inquiry and investigation might as well be spared. It is much easier to adopt the popular belief at once; for after all our labor and care, to this we must come at last. Besides; in this way we avoid all the pain and popular odium, which a change of religious opinion frequently involves. But, had this course been pursued, by all who have gone before us, what

would our condition now have been as to science or religion? We had to-day, been sitting in darkness, and saying to the works of our own hands—"ye are our gods." *The Bible is the religion of Protestants*, and among all the sects into which they are divided, free inquiry is, to a certain extent inculcated. Most sects, however, have their limits fixed, beyond which if a man goes, he becomes suspected, and perhaps is denounced as an heretic. He may inquire, and investigate as much as he pleases, to support the peculiar tenets of his sect, but beyond this it is dangerous to proceed. Should he push his inquiries further, and find some of them the inventions of men, he must conceal his discoveries, for if he does not, the vengeance of the whole sect, if not the whole religious community, will be poured out on his head. I must be very fond of suffering, thus to expose myself.

3d, Since I am to be condemned, because my investigations have not resulted in the popular belief of the doctrine of endless hell torments, I do not see any possible way of getting rid of error, or increasing in knowledge. I have done no more than thousands have done before me; to examine the Bible for myself, and state the result for the consideration of others. Such as have done so, have seldom escaped the appellation of heretics. But the first to condemn others, are generally the last to examine for themselves, what is truth on any religious subject. If in this investigation, I have travelled beyond the record, let this be pointed out by an appeal to the same record. If a man under mistaken views of a religious doctrine, avows his mistaken sentiments, and thereby brings more truth to light, and excites inquiry, are not these valuable ends served to society?

4th, Supposing the views which have been advanced, had been the universal belief of the religious community, and the opposite doctrine had never been known

in the world. Allowing that I had come forward, and attempted to show, that endless misery in hell was a doctrine taught in Scripture, and that the contrary was a mistaken view of the subject. Beyond all doubt I should be liable to the very same condemnation to which I am now subjected. The trumpet would sound loud and long, by all religious parties against me. It would be sagely and gravely remarked,—“what a dreadful doctrine he has embraced. What dreadful views his doctrine gives of the God who made us. He represents him as dooming a great part of his creatures to endless misery in hell. His inquiries have led him into a most dreadful error.” I appeal to every candid man if this would not be my fate, and if as good ground was not afforded for such conclusions and condemnations in the one case, as in the other. But let us view the two opposite doctrines in the following points of light.

1st, How does the two doctrines affect the character of God? Let us view them as to the promises of God. He promised that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent. To bruise a serpent's head is to kill or destroy it. But is the serpent's head bruised, if the greater part of the human race are to be eternally miserable? Even this is too gross to be believed, by respectable orthodox writers in the present day. Mr. Emerson, in his book on the Millennium, commenting on Gen. iii. 15. thus writes, p. 11. “Now the question arises, Has the serpent's head been bruised in any degree answerable to the manifest import of the passage under consideration? A great part of mankind have gone to destruction. Does this look like bruising the serpent's head? If the greater part of the human race are to be lost by the cunning craftiness of satan, will that look like bruising his head? To me it would seem far otherwise. Should satan continue the god of this world from the beginning to the end of time, leading whole nations captive at his will, surely he will seem to have



cause to triumph. But the head of satan must be bruised ; his plots must be crushed. Are all mankind to be saved ? Certainly not. That would be giving the lie to numerous declarations of eternal Truth ; it would be throwing away the Bible at once. And if the Bible be thrown away, it would be impossible to prove the salvation of any. But there is no doubt that by far the greater part of mankind will be saved. This appears necessary, in order that the serpent's head may be bruised. I am strongly inclined to the opinion of Dr. Hopkins, that of the whole human race, thousands will be saved for one that is lost."

We are happy to see from such respectable authors, that "thousands will be saved for one that is lost : " and that if the greater part of the human race are to be lost, satan's head would not be bruised, but that he would have cause to triumph. If so many must be saved, as stated in this quotation, to avoid these consequences, we would suggest it for the consideration of all, as well as that of the worthy author, whether satan's head could be bruised, or he destroyed, and whether he would not have cause of triumph if one individual of the human race was lost. If but one was left in his power, to be tormented forever, how could his head be bruised, and would he not triumph in this small conquest, as well as over one in a thousand ? We do not see how the number could materially alter the case. We seriously think, that if the number to be saved be so great, in proportion to those lost, we would do well to consider if all mankind may not be saved, and that we may believe this without throwing away our Bibles. On this quotation, we cannot help remarking, how different the sentiments contained in it are, to what was considered true orthodoxy in former ages. In those days, it would have been considered throwing away the Bible, to say that thousands will be saved for one lost, just as much as saying in these, that all will be saved. If Christ comes

so near saving the whole human race, in the name of humanity, why not let his triumph be complete ; why strain at the gnat and swallow the camel ? God also promised to Abraham, that in his seed, which was Christ, all the families of the earth should be blessed. But if the doctrine of endless misery be true, and a great part of mankind are decreed to such a punishment, how can this promise of God be fulfilled ? Let any one go over the promises and predictions of the Old Testament, and then candidly say, if he finds them in unison with the limited views of salvation which most men entertain. It would be as endless, as useless, for me to dwell on this topic.

But let us view the two doctrines in regard to the threatenings of God. The doctrine of eternal misery supposes, that God threatened Adam, that in the day he ate of the forbidden fruit he should die, and that death threatened, is said to be endless misery in hell. Hell torment, then, was threatened before sin existed, or before the promise of a Savior was given. But is this a correct understanding of the death threatened Adam. The falsehood of it is evident from one fact, that Adam, Noah, Abraham, and all the Old Testament believers, did not so understand it. If they had, would they not have taught it to mankind ?

But let us also view the two doctrines, in regard to the attributes or character of God. It has been said, that my views are very dishonorable to God's character. His justice, his holiness, and truth are dishonored, if there be no endless punishment for all the wicked. But if my views dishonor God's justice, holiness and truth, what comes of his mercy and goodness, if the opposite doctrine be true ? We have seen attempts made by some metaphysical writers, to reconcile eternal misery with the mercy and goodness of God, but in vain. All they have said, is only enveloping the subject in a mist, or throwing dust in people's eyes to blind

them on this subject. It is reported of the late Dr. Osgood, that when he was asked the question, "how he reconciled the doctrine of eternal misery with the character of God as a God of mercy and goodness;" he lifted both his hands, and said, "if any man is able to do this I cannot do it." Whether God is more glorified in men's damnation or in their salvation, I need not discuss. One thing is certain; that those called orthodox writers in the present day, are fully aware, that if God did not ultimately save the greatest part of mankind, God's character would be dishonored. If this was not the case, who could deny that the devil was more honored than God? Mr. Emerson, aware of this, agrees with another celebrated divine, that those saved at last, will exceed those that are lost by a large majority. I am truly glad, to see men of intelligence, so much concerned for God's honor and glory in this respect; and I hope the time is not very distant, when they may think God most honored and glorified by saving the whole human race. It is a very evident case, that those writers do not hesitate to dissent from ancient orthodoxy. Had they written so in some former ages, they would have suffered death, in some of its most terrific forms for their temerity. At any rate, I am not a greater heretic now, than they would have been then.

2d, How do the views advanced, and their opposite affect the Scriptures of Truth? I think it will not be denied, that my views of all the passages in which Gehenna occurs, are explained consistently with themselves, and their respective contexts. That so far from the contexts being at variance with the texts, they direct to the explanations given. When a man perverts the Scriptures, he does it in the face of facts, and shutting his eyes against the context and Scripture usage of words, indulges his own imagination. But here the reverse is the case. The context points out the sense I have given Gehenna; Scripture usage comes in aid; nor is

any thing taken for granted, or imagination indulged. But that Gehenna is a place of future misery, is assumed, and asserted without proof, and when the context and Scripture usage are consulted for evidence, all they afford is on the opposite side.

3d, Let us see how the two doctrines affect the various religious sects in the world. Allowing that this doctrine was universally the faith of all parties, discord must cease, and Christians would embrace each other as children of the same father, and heirs of the same inheritance. It would lead all sects, to treat each other very differently from what they have done. But how does the opposite doctrine operate among them? Hell being a place of endless misery, Christians have been for ages, consigning each other over to its punishment, and that often for conscientious differences of religious opinions.

4th, Let us consider, how my views and their opposite, affect the diffusion of the gospel in the world. Say some, "if your views are correct, why trouble ourselves, or be at such an expense to send the gospel to the heathen? The principal object in sending missionaries to the heathen in our day, seems to be, to save them from hell. If this be the object of sending them, we think they may abide at home; for certainly they are running on an errand to them, on which the apostles were never sent. Those who wish to see what they proposed, yea, accomplished, by preaching to the heathen, may consult the Acts of the apostles, and all the epistles. Because there is no eternal torment from which to save them, shall we not impart to them the knowledge and hope of eternal life? Unless we can terrify them with preaching hell, shall we let them live and die ignorant about heaven? In short, because we cannot save them from a place where they shall dishonor God and be punished by him forever, shall we not save them from dishonoring his name and from punishment in the present

world? Unless we have the honor, of saving the heathen from everlasting punishment in hell, it seems we do not think them worthy of our notice to do them any good. I pity the man who can think, and feel, and reason at such a rate. Supposing the happiness of heaven and the torment of hell out of the question, and that the heathen world were as ignorant of science, agriculture, and the arts of life, as they are of spiritual things, how ought we to think, and feel, and reason on this subject? Deists and Atheists in this case would put Christians to the blush, if they would do them no service, because they had no hell torments to save them from. My views of hell, so far from abating true Christian zeal, only gives it a right direction. The zeal manifested in the present day in behalf of the heathen is highly to be commended, and nothing prevents its being more generally approved, but the object towards which it is directed. It is zeal, but we think it is not according to the knowledge of Scripture. If an intelligent heathen, were to ask a modern missionary, after hearing him preach hell torments, the following questions, what could he answer?—Do you profess to take the apostles, as a pattern in your preaching and conduct? To this the missionary would without doubt reply in the affirmative. Give me leave, says he, then, to ask you, what heathen nation they ever went to and preached as you do to us, that they came to save them from a place called *hell*? To what sermon of theirs can you refer us, in which they mentioned the word *hell*, which is so often upon your lips?—Were I this missionary, such questions would non-plus me. But to what could any missionary appeal, showing that those persons were all exposed to endless torments in hell? Not to his Bible, a book they know nothing about? Not to any thing he could point them to as an object of sight, feeling, or hearing. He could indeed refer them back to the old heathen fables about hell, from which source Dr. Campbell thinks the Jews deriv-



ed this notion. But we are rather inclined to think, so far as our knowledge of present heathenism goes, that the heathen have forgotten the ancient fables about hell, and are obliged to Christians for reviving this ancient doctrine of their fathers among them.

5th, Let us see which of the two doctrines accords best with the prayers of every good man. What a good man desires, and is agreeable to his best feelings, for this he prays. Accordingly, it is common with all Christians to pray for the salvation of all men; and we believe that they do this often with holy and ardent desires for its accomplishment. But, is there not a contradiction between their wishes, feelings, and prayers, and their professed creed? If they are confident all will never be saved, but only a small number elected to everlasting happiness, why pray for the salvation of all men? Their prayers ought to be restricted to the elect. And we see not, why they ought not to pray for the eternal misery of all the rest, seeing it is the will, yea, the eternal decree of God that they should be forever miserable. All we request here, is, that every Christian would impartially and seriously examine, if my views may not be true, which are so much in unison with his wishes, his best feelings, and his prayers, when in the most solemn intercourse with his God. If I am in an error, it is strange that this error should have such a place in the desires, and feelings, and prayers of all Christians.

6th, How do my views and the opposite affect the eternal condition of men? According to my views, not one of the human race is to be punished forever in hell or Gehenna. This, is certainly a pleasing thought, amidst all the guilt and woe in our world. But how does the contrary doctrine represent this? That a certain number, no better than others, are to be received into heaven to enjoy its happiness forever. All the rest of the human race are to be banished to hell tor-

ments forever. The husband, the parent, the brother, the sister, shall look down from heaven on their relations in hell, and so far from having any pity at seeing them in such unspeakable and eternal torment, the very sight shall enhance and increase their happiness. Now, give me leave to ask, and let conscience speak, which of these two views is likely to be the truth. Unless every thing like Christian feeling is banished from heaven, can such a doctrine be true? Yea, I ask, if Christian feelings are known in this place? Is it possible that the happiness of the place could be enjoyed, while it is known, that a single individual is to be eternally miserable? If this be true, then, a believer does not better his situation, as to Christian feeling, by going to heaven. I once saw the idea highly extolled in an account of missionary proceedings—"that a Christian could not feel happy, so long as he knew, that there was a single individual of the human race without the knowledge and belief of the gospel." This is like a Christian in this world. Heaven is then a change for the worse; if the eternal torment of innumerable beings in hell, is to afford an increase of joy to the inhabitants of heaven. For my own part, I must say that with such feelings, I could not be happy in heaven. If my views, and feelings, and reasonings on this subject are wrong, I hold myself in readiness to be corrected by an appeal to the Scriptures, by any person in the universe of God.

To conclude. With the following remarks, we shall take our leave of this subject for the present.

1st, The books of the Old Testament, says Jahn, in his introduction, p 4. go "back to sixteen centuries before the Christian era. The most ancient of them are between six and seven hundred years older than Homer, the oldest Greek poet, who lived in the ninth century before Christ; and about eleven hundred years older than Herodotus, the earliest Grecian historian, who wrote in the fifth century before Christ, and near the time

when Malachi and Nehemiah composed the last of the Hebrew Scriptures." Now, let the reader notice, that in these ancient sacred writings, not a syllable is to be found respecting endless hell torments. This doctrine is not taught under the name Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, Gehenna, or by any other mode of expression. Mr. Stuart, does not pretend, that *endless* punishment is taught in the books of the Old Testament; and his very attempt to prove, that *Sheol* included in it a Tartarus or place of future punishment, shows, they afforded no solid evidence of such a doctrine. After all his efforts to prove this, he is obliged to beg of his readers, to grant that this may *probably* be true. But, it is now generally conceded by orthodox critics and commentators, that all the punishments mentioned in the Old Testament, are of a temporal nature, and are confined to the present state of existence.

Here then are inspired writings, "sixteen centuries before the Christian era," none of which teach either endless or limited punishment in a future state. Now, let any candid man say, if either of these doctrines had been believed by these ancient sacred writers, would they not have taught it? Can any other reason be assigned, why they did not teach it, except, that it was not revealed by God, or believed by them? Let it be remembered, that in these ancient records, God promised to Abraham, that "in his seed, (Christ Gal. iii. 16,) all the nations and families of the earth were to be blessed." See Gen. xii. 3; xxii. 18. But, if some of these families of the earth, were in danger of limited or eternal punishment in hell, who can believe, that these ancient sacred records, would have been silent on the subject? Dr. Good, speaking of Arabia, says—"The oldest work that has descended to us from this quarter, (and there is little doubt that it is the oldest, or one of the oldest works in existence,) is that astonishing and transcendant composition, the book of Job." But in this old-

est book in existence, not a word, in any shape, is to be found respecting future hell torments, and yet a future life by a resurrection from the dead is taught in it. Job xix. 25—28. xiv. 7—15. The hope of future life was entertained in those ancient times, and this hope was expressed. But if the fear of future punishment was also entertained, why was not it expressed?

Had no future existence been revealed in those ancient sacred writings, no surprise would be excited, that they are silent on the subject of endless or limited future punishment. But the above texts, and Hebrews chap. 11, with other texts which might be referred to, put it out of all question that a future life was known and believed in those days. Men then, had a promise of future life to believe, but had no threatening of future endless punishment to fear. Such was the state of things among those who enjoyed the earliest records of divine revelation. Where can you find in them, any fears expressed by a single individual, either respecting himself or others, that after death there was either an endless or limited future punishment to be endured? Whether persons died, a sudden or a lingering death; by their own hands or the hands of others; in the ordinary course of events or by the immediate hand of God; not a syllable escapes the lips of any one, that any of them had gone to hell to suffer such a punishment. The love of life and the fear of death, prevailed then as now, but no man seems to have feared punishment of any kind beyond it. And the reason why men had no dread of punishment after death was, they had no knowledge concerning it. But let us now see,

2d, What was the state of knowledge among the heathen nations, respecting future punishment, during the period of sixteen centuries before the christian era, while those ancient sacred records were enjoyed by others? Did they believe in future punishment, and in endless punishment? Most assuredly they did. It

is well known, that both the Greeks and Romans, believed in endless punishment. And we have seen, from Mr. Stuart and his son above, that this doctrine was derived by them from the ancient Egyptians. The Egyptian *Amenti*, was the prototype, and origin of the Hades of the Greeks, and Tartarus of the Latins. And Dr. Good we have seen, declares, that the doctrine of future punishment, is taught in the earliest records of Egyptian history. Now, it is manifest, they did not derive this doctrine from the earliest records of divine revelation, for they are as silent as the grave on the subject, of endless or limited punishment after death. Be it also remembered, that Moses who wrote the first five books of the Bible was brought up in Egypt, and was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. It is very certain then, if he had believed the doctrine of future punishment originated from God, he would have taught it in his writings. Had it been a truth from him, which the Egyptians had received through tradition, or lost revelations, it cannot be questioned, but he would have approved of it, and taught it to the Hebrews. But he gives no hint, that this doctrine was true, or ought to be believed, any more than the doctrine of transmigration, which was also believed by the Egyptians. Is it not then a very extraordinary fact, that the heathen nations who had no divine revelation, should know all about endless hell torments in those days, yet those who enjoyed the earliest records of divine revelation, should be ignorant and silent about them? Why should the heathen fables be full of this doctrine, yet God's revelations to men, silent on the subject? Why should the heathen philosophers, know so well about it, yet the inspired writers know nothing about it?

But the reader ought also to notice, under what shape the doctrine of future punishment, was believed and taught among the heathen nations. Dr. Good remarks, it is—"curious to observe the different grounds appeal-



ed to in favor of a future existence, in the most learned regions of the east: The Hindu philosophers totally and universally denying a resurrection of the body, and supporting the doctrine alone upon the natural immortality of the soul, and the Arabian philosophers passing over the immortality of the soul, and resting it alone upon a resurrection of the body." He adds, that in Arabia, whence the book of Job originated, the immortality of the soul, is—"left in as blank and barren a silence, as the deserts by which they are surrounded." It is very evident then, that if the doctrine of future punishment was believed in Arabia, it was a punishment after the resurrection from the dead. But no countenance is given to such an opinion in the book of Job, which originated in Arabia, and is the oldest book in the world. But it is equally evident, that future punishment as held by the Hindu philosophers and other heathen nations, was the punishment of the *immortal soul* separate from the body, for they did not believe in the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead. When Paul preached it at Athens, the peopled mocked at it; for a resurrection from the dead was deemed by the heathen incredible. Their hope of future happiness, and dread of future misery, depended on the truth or falsehood of the doctrine they had believed, that the soul was immortal, and at death went either to Elysium to be happy, or to Tartarus to be miserable. They could have no hope on the one hand of future happiness, or dread of future misery on the other, but on the ground that the soul was immortal. We ought then to notice, that the doctrine of the soul's immortality, was commonly believed among all the heathen nations. But we should enquire

3d, If in those ancient sacred writings, some of which existed sixteen centuries before the christian era, any thing is taught respecting the immortality of the soul. Nothing of the kind appears in any part of them, The

*soul*, is never once mentioned in the bible as *immortal*. And in the book of Job, the oldest of the sacred books, the only ground stated for a future life, is a resurrection from the dead. Dr. Good, we have seen, says, in Arabia whence the book of Job emanated, this was the only ground for a future life known there. We search the Bible in vain, to find the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; and yet, what doctrine is more generally believed among christians? This doctrine, like the doctrine of future punishment, with which it is closely connected, is abundantly taught in heathen authors, and can be fairly traced to heathen origin. The next question then is,

4th, How the doctrine of the soul's immortality originated among the heathen? It seems to be indisputable, that the immortality of the soul, was believed by most of the heathen nations. It was received among the Egyptians, Celts, Scythians, and other nations. It was taught by Zamolxis, Orpheus, Socrates, Plato, and a host of others. As it is not taught in the oldest records of divine revelation, nor in any part of the Bible, how came it to be so common among the heathen nations, who had no divine revelation? From whence did it originate among men? For on the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the doctrine of future punishment is founded. This doctrine among the heathen nations, could not exist without the immortality of the soul. The following quotations from Endfield's philosophy gives the best account we can find of the origin of this doctrine. He says vol. 1, p. 50—"According to Zoroaster, various orders of spiritual beings, gods or dæmons, have proceeded from the deity, which are more or less perfect, as they are at a greater or less distance, in the course of emanation, from the eternal fountain of intelligence; among which, the human soul is a particle of divine light, which will return to its source, and partake of its immortality; and matter is the last and most dis-

tant emanation from the first source of being, which, on account of its distance from the fountain of light, becomes opaque and inert, and whilst it remains in this state is the cause of evil; but being gradually refined, it will at length return to the fountain whence it flowed. This doctrine of emanation afterwards produced many fanciful opinions in theology."

This doctrine of *emanation*, was extensively believed among the heathen nations, and from it the doctrine of the soul's immortality seems to have originated. Herodotus asserts, that the Egyptians—"were the first people who taught this doctrine." Speaking of the Indians, Enfield says p. 56—"The human soul they represented as of divine original, because, with all the other Eastern nations, they conceived it to be a particle, or an emanation, of that intellectual fire, by which they believed the universe to be animated. Their doctrine of the return of the soul to God, which some have confounded with the Christian doctrine of the resurrection, seems to have meant nothing more, than that the soul, after being disengaged from the grosser material body, would be re-united to the fountain of all being, the soul of the world. It is an opinion still found among the Indians, and probably of very ancient date, that there is in nature a periodical restitution of all things; when, after the return of all derived beings to their source, they are again sent forth, and the whole course of things is renewed. Inferior divinities were doubtless, worshipped among them as emanations from the first spring of life."

The doctrine of the immortality of the soul, seems to have had one common origin among the heathen, and was communicated from one nation to another. On p. 121, 122, Enfield says—"the human soul, Orpheus, after the Thracians and Egyptians, from whom he derived his philosophy, held to be immortal. Diodorus Siculus relates, that he was the first who taught

(that is among the Greeks) the doctrine of the future punishment of the wicked, and the future happiness of the good. That this doctrine, was commonly received among the followers of Orpheus, appears from the following anecdote. A priest of Orpheus, who was exceedingly poor and wretched, boasting to Philip of Macedon, that all who were admitted into the Orphic mysteries would be happy after death, Philip said to him, ‘why then do you not immediately die, and put an end to your poverty and misery?’—The planets and the moon, Orpheus conceived to be habitable worlds, and the stars to be fiery bodies like the sun: he taught that they are animated by divinities; an opinion, which had been commonly received in the East, and which was afterwards adopted by the Pythagoreans, and other Grecian philosophers.” Much more might be quoted from the same writer. But we have quoted enough, to show the origin of the doctrine, that the soul is immortal, and its extensive diffusion among the heathen nations. It was not however universally believed, for Aristotle, Dicaearchus, Ocellus, and others denied it; and even Socrates, and other wise men among the heathen, doubted it. Besides, the speculations of the heathen were various about it. The strongest believers in this doctrine, derived little benefit from it, and for a good reason, it had no solid foundation. It originated in the speculations of men, who, “professing themselves to be wise had become fools.”

5th, But it may be asked—is not the doctrine of the soul’s immortality, revealed in the New Testament? No; for if it was taught there, it would be no revelation from God to the world, for it was a popular doctrine among the heathen nations, many centuries before the christian era. With more propriety it might be said, the heathen reveal this doctrine to God, than that God revealed it to them. Had the New Testament writers, believed the soul to be immortal, why did they never

speaking of it as such? And why did they not alarm their hearers, as orthodox preachers do, describing the everlasting misery to which their precious immortal souls were exposed? But no such descriptions are to be found in the New Testament, notwithstanding such descriptions, would have accorded with the heathen popular opinions on the subject. But, though the heathen believed the soul immortal, and had hope of its living happy after death, the New Testament writers declared to them, they had "no hope," and were "without God in the world." Eph. ii. 12. 1 Thess. iv. 13. With little truth or propriety could they have said this, had they believed the soul immortal, and that men might hope for happiness after death on this ground. And with still less truth or propriety could Paul say, if Christ be not raised, they "who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." If their souls were immortal, they never could have perished, had Christ slept for ever in the grave.

6th, But some will no doubt ask—may not future, yea, endless punishment still be maintained, if the immortality of the soul was abandoned? This we more than doubt, for future punishment depends on, and arose out of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Among the heathen, the first of these doctrines, could not exist without the last. Socrates and Plato, would have deemed the man insane, who taught future punishment, yet denied the doctrine of the soul's immortality; for like all the heathen they considered a resurrection from the dead incredible. How could any person be punished after death, if he did not live in a conscious state of existence, to be punished? Punishment after death, will in all probability be believed, so long as men think the doctrine of the soul's immortality true. The branch cannot wither, so long as this root exists to nourish it. But when it dies, the branch of course dies; and with it, all the bitter fruits it brings forth will be destroyed.



Is it said—may not men be punished after the resurrection from the dead? To this I answer,—if the bible teaches this, let us believe it. Let the passages, which are supposed to teach it, be carefully and candidly considered. But, after all the care and candor I can bring to this subject, I frankly confess, it is not in my power to find this doctrine taught in the Bible. It frequently speaks of the *hope* of the resurrection of the dead, but never of any man's *fear* of it. It teaches, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, but never teaches, that men will be sinners after this period. On the contrary, it says, they shall be equal unto the angels of God which are in heaven. But it does not say, any of them shall be equal unto the devils which are in hell. What the Bible does teach, let us believe. But what it does not say, permit me to leave for those, who desire to be wise above what is written.

THE END.

# INDEX

TO TEXTS QUOTED AND ILLUSTRATED.

Ch.	v.	Page.	Ch.	v.	Page.
	GENESIS.		18: 5		27
37: 35		19	30: 3		27
42: 38		19	31: 17		28
44: 29.		19	49: 14		28
44: 31		19	49: 15		29
	NUMBERS.		55: 15		29
16: 30		19	86: 13		30
16: 33		20	88: 3		30
	DUTERONOMY.		89: 48		31
32: 22		20	116: 3		31
	I SAMUEL.		139: 8		31
2: 6		21	141: 7		31
	II SAMUEL.		PROVERBS.		
22: 6		21	1: 12		31
	I KINGS.		5: 5		31
2: 6		21	9: 18		32
2: 9		22	15: 11		32
	JOB.		23: 14		33
7: 9		23	27: 20		34
11: 8		23	30: 15, 16		34
14: 13		23	ECCLESIASTES.		
17: 13		24	9: 10		34
17: 16		24	CANTICLES.		
21: 13		24	8: 6		34
24: 19		24	ISAIAH.		
26: 6		24	5: 14		34
	PSLAMs.		14: 9		35
6: 5		24	14: 15		35
9: 17		25	28: 15		38
16: 10		26	28: 18		38

Ch.	v.	Page.	Ch.	v.	Page.
33:	14	154	18:	9	151
38:	18	38	23:	15	158
57:	9	40	23:	33	159
64:	24	183		MARK.	
	JEREMIAH.		9:	43—49	175
7:		117		LUKE.	
19:		117	10:	15	59
23:	39, 40	155	12;	4, 5	187
	EZEKIEL.		16:	23	59
31:	15	41		ACTS.	
31:	16	41	2:	27	84
31:	17	41	2:	31	84
32:	21	41		I CORINTHIANS.	
32:	27	41	15:	55	84
	HOSEA.			JAMES.	
13:	14	41	3:	6	190
	AMOS.			II PETER.	
9:	2	42	2:	4	91
	JONAH.			JUDE.	
2:	2	42	—:	6	91
	MATTHEW.			REVELATION.	
5:	22	134	1:	18	84
5:	28, 29	137	6:	8	84
10:	28	139	20:	13	85
11:	23	58	20:	14	85
16:	18	59			

## BOOKS PUBLISHED BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1st, An Inquiry into the Scriptural Import of the Words *Sheol, Hades, Tartarus* and *Gehenna*, all translated Hell in the common English Version. Price bound in cloth \$1

2d, A Reply to Mr. J. Sabine's Lectures on the 'Inquiry.' Price, 50 cents.

3d, An Inquiry into the Scriptural Doctrine concerning the Devil and Satan, and into the Extent of Duration expressed by the Terms *Oulm, Aion, and Aionios*, rendered Everlasting, Forever, ect. in the common Version, and especially when applied to Punishment. Price, boards, \$1. Bound in sheep, \$1 25.

4th, Three Essays, on the intermediate State of the Dead, the Resurrection from the Dead, and on the Greek Terms rendered Judge, Judgment, Condemned, Condemnation, Damned, Damnation, ect. in the New Testament: with Remarks on Mr. C. Hudson's Letters in Vindication of a future Retribution, addressed to Mr. Hosea Ballou, Boston. Price, boards, \$1. Bound in sheep, \$1 25.

5th, A Letter to Dr. Allen, President of Bowdoin College, in Reply to his Lecture on the Doctrine of Universal Salvation, delivered in the Chapel of Bowdoin College, and published by Request of the Students. Price 25 cents.

6th, Letters on the Immortality of the Soul, the intermediate State of the Dead, and a future Retribution, in Reply to Mr. C. Hudson, Westminister, Mass. Price, boards, \$1. Bound in sheep, \$1 25.

The above books are for sale, by B. B. Mussey; at the Trumpet Office; by Baker & Alexander; by Marsh, Capen & Lyon; by Munroe & Francis; by R. P. & C. Williams; and by Josiah Loring, Boston. Also by Wait & Dow, and the Author Charlestown; and by booksellers, and others, in most states in the Union. 20 per cent discount to those who purchase by the quantity.

N. B. In the course of the present year, we intend publishing our Letters to Professor Stuart, printed in the Universalist Magazine in 1820. They show, how the author was led to become a Universalist; the pains he was at to avoid being one; what gave rise to all the above publications; and that Mr. Stuart, might then have prevented him from ever being a Universalist.











\_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01029 2755